arXiv:hep-ph/9311259v1 10 Nov 1993

Equivalence of Hamiltonian and Lagrangian Path Integral Quantization

Carsten Grosse-Knetter[1]
Dissertation

Universität Bielefeld
Fakultät für Physik
November 1993

BI-TP 93/56
hep-ph/9311259

---

[1] E-Mail: knetter@physw.uni-bielefeld.de

This thesis is essentially a combination of the author's following publications:

- C. Grosse-Knetter and R. Kögerler, *Unitary Gauge, Stueckelberg Formalism and Gauge Invariant Models for Effective Lagrangians*, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 2865 (1993)
- C. Grosse-Knetter, *Hamiltonian Quantization of Effective Lagrangians with Massive Vector Fields*, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 2854 (1993)
- C. Grosse-Knetter, *Effective Lagrangians with Higher Derivatives*, Bielefeld Preprint BI-TP 93/29 (1993), hep-ph/9306321
- C. Grosse-Knetter, *Equivalence of Hamiltonian and Lagrangian Path Integral Quantization: Effective Gauge Theories*, Bielefeld Preprint BI-TP 93/40 (1993), hep-ph/9308201, to be published in Phys. Rev. **D**

Contents

1 Introduction **3**

2 The Unitary Gauge and the Stueckelberg Formalism **9**
2.1 Preliminaries and Notation 12
2.2 Derivation of the U-Gauge by Gauge Fixing 15
2.3 R_ξ-Limiting Procedure 19
2.4 Decoupling the Unphysical Scalars 21
2.5 The Stueckelberg Formalism 25
2.6 The Gauged Nonlinear σ-Model 28
2.7 Effective Lagrangians 28

3 Constrained Hamiltonian Systems **31**
3.1 Dynamics of Constrained Systems 33
3.2 The Hamiltonian Path Integral for Constrained Systems 37

4 Effective Lagrangians with Massive Vector Fields **39**
4.1 The HLE Theorem for Gauge Noninvariant Models 41
4.2 The Stueckelberg Formalism 45
4.3 Higgs Models 51
4.4 The Quartically Divergent Higgs Self-Interaction 52

5 Effective Lagrangians with Higher Derivatives **55**
5.1 The Ostrogradsky Formalism 56
5.2 Reduction of Higher-Order Effective Lagrangians 60
5.3 Massive Vector Fields 64
  5.3.1 Gauge Noninvariant Models 64
  5.3.2 Gauged Nonlinear σ-Models 65
  5.3.3 Higgs Models 67

6 Effective Gauge Theories **69**
6.1 The HLE Theorem for Effective Gauge Theories 70
6.2 Effective Gauge Theories with Higher Derivatives 76

7 Summary **79**

Acknowledgements **81**

Bibliography **82**

Chapter 1

Introduction

Effective Lagrangians containing massless or massive vector fields with arbitrary (non–Yang–Mills) self couplings are investigated very intensively in the literature in order to parametrize possible deviations of the self interactions of the electroweak gauge bosons $W^{\pm}$, Z and γ [1, 2, 3] and of the gluons [4] from the standard model predictions with respect to experimental tests of these couplings. In [1, 2, 3, 4] it is always implicitely assumed that the Feynman rules, which are the basis for calculations of S-Matrix elements and cross sections, can directly be obtained from the effective Lagrangian, i.e., the quadratic terms in the Lagrangian yield the propagators and the cubic, quartic, etc. terms yield the vertices in the standard manner. This simple quantization rule is known as *Matthews's theorem*[1] [5]. Within the framework of the the Feynman path intergral (PI) formalism [6, 7, 8] (where the Feynman rules follow from the generating functional) this theorem can be reformulated as follows:

> *Given a Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ with an arbitrary interaction term, the corresponding generating functional can be written as a Lagrangian PI*
>
> $$Z[J] = \int \mathcal{D}\Phi \, \exp\left\{ i \int d^4x \, [\mathcal{L}_{quant} + J\Phi] \right\} \tag{1.1}$$
>
> *(where Φ is a shorthand notation for all fields in $\mathcal{L}_{quant}$). If $\mathcal{L}$ has no gauge freedom, the quantized Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_{quant}$ occurring in the PI is identical to the primordial one*
>
> $$\mathcal{L}_{quant} = \mathcal{L}. \tag{1.2}$$
>
> *If $\mathcal{L}$ has a gauge freedom, the generating functional* (1.1) *is the same as the one obtained in the Faddeev–Popov (FP) formalism* [7, 8] *(in an arbitrary gauge) with the quantized Lagrangian*
>
> $$\mathcal{L}_{quant} = \mathcal{L} + \mathcal{L}_{g.f.} + \mathcal{L}_{ghost}, \tag{1.3}$$
>
> *which contains an additional gauge-fixing (g.f.) term and a ghost term.*

---

[1] Matthews himself proved this theorem only for the very simple case of interaction terms with at most first powers of derivatives and he used the canonical quantization formalism instead of the PI formalism [5].

The generating functional (1.1) with (1.2) or (1.3) is very convenient for practical calculations because it is manifestly Lorentz invariant (if a covariant gauge is choosen), it does not involve the generalized momenta corresponding to the fields and, as mentioned above, it directly implies the Feynman rules; for this reason it is used in all practical calculations [1, 2, 3, 4]. However, it is well known that, in general, quantization has to be based on the more elaborate Hamiltonian PI formalism [9, 10, 11, 12, 13]. The naive Lagrangian PI formalism [6, 7, 8], where (1.1) with (1.2) is taken as the ansatz for the generating functional, can a priori only be applied to quantize physical systems without derivative couplings and without constraints. Thus, to prove Matthews's theorem, one has to derive the Lagrangian PI (1.1) with (1.2) or (1.3) from the Hamiltonian PI, i.e. one has to show that the correct Hamiltonian PI formalism and the naive Lagrangian PI formalism are equivalent. For this reason, I will not use the historical designation "Matthews's theorem" for the above statement but the name *Hamilton–Lagrange equivalence theorem (HLE theorem),* which is more adequate to its modern PI formulation.

The HLE theorem was proven by Bernard and Duncan [10] for effective interactions of scalar fields (without higher derivatives of the fields), i.e. for physical sytems which do not involve constraints. Vector fields and fermion fields, however, are subject to constraints. Thus, in order to derive the HLE theorem for the general case, one has to take into account the formalism of quantization of constrained systems, which goes back to Dirac [14] and was formulated within the path integral formalism by Faddeev [9] (for first-class constrained, i.e. gauge invariant, systems) and by Senjanovic [11] (for second-class constrained, i.e. gauge noninvariant, systems). Besides, in these works the equivalence of Hamiltonian and Lagrangian PI quantization was shown for Yang–Mills theories [9] and for massive Yang–Mills theories [11] *without* additional effective interaction terms. Extensive treatises on Hamiltonian quantization of constrained systems can be found in textbooks about this subject [12, 13]. In this thesis I will give a general proof of the HLE theorem[2] for arbitrary interactions of all physically important types of particles, viz. scalars, fermions, massless and massive vector bosons. I will also take into account the case of effective interactions which involve higher derivatives of the fields.

Particular attention will be paid to effective interactions of massive vector fields because they are most interesting from the phenomenological and from the theoretical point of view. Three types of effective theories with massive vector fields can be found in the literature, namely gauge noninvariant Lagrangians [1], spontaneously broken gauge theories (SBGTs) with a nonlinearly realized scalar sector and without physical Higgs bosons [2] (called gauged nonlinear σ-models or chiral Lagrangians) and SBGTs with a linearely realized scalar sector which contain (a) physical Higgs boson(s) [3]. In fact, the proof of the HLE theorem for gauge noninvariant Lagrangians can be extended to the case of gauge invariant Lagrangians because, by applying a Stueckelberg transformation [18, 19], each SBGT can be rewritten as a gauge noninvariant model (after a nonlinear parametrization of the scalar sector [20, 21] in the case of a linear Higgs model). A Stueckelberg transformation is a field transformation (that involves derivatives of the fields) which results in removing all unphysical scalar fields (pseudo-Goldstone fields) from the Lagrangian. The resulting Lagrangian is called the unitary gauge (U-gauge) of the original SBGT. On the other hand, by using the Stueckelberg formalism, an arbitrary gauge noninvariant Lagrangian can be written as a (nonlinear) SBGT [22] and by introduction of (a) physical Higgs boson(s) it can be extended to a linear Higgs model. In this thesis I will reformulate the Stueckelberg formalism within the Hamiltonian formalism, thereby establishing the physical equivalence of gauge invariant Lagrangians and the corresponding gauge noninvariant U-gauge Lagrangians. On this basis I will prove the HLE theorem for SBGTs by first deriving the Faddeev–Popov PI for the case of the U-gauge[3] and then using the equivalence of all gauges, i.e. the independence of the S-matrix elements from the choice of the gauge in the Faddeev–Popov formalism [20, 23], in order to generalize this result to any other gauge.

---

[2] Recently several works about the equivalence of Hamiltonian and Lagrangian PI quantization have been published [15]. However, in [15] the equivalence of the (Hamiltonian) Batalin–Fradkin–Vilkovisky (BFV) PI formalism [16] to the (Lagrangian) Batalin–Vilkovisky (BV) PI formalism [17] is proven; both are very formal and abstract formalisms, which are not directly connected to the usual Hamiltonian [9, 11] or Lagrangian [6, 7] PI formalism. My work is completely different from [15] since I prove the equivalence of the (Hamiltonian) Faddeev–Senjanovic PI [9, 11] (which is the fundamental one because it can be derived from elemantary dynamics) to the (Lagrangian) Feynman–Faddeev–Popov PI [6, 7] (wich is the one used in all practical calculations [1, 2, 3, 4]) *without* applying the BFV [16] or the BV [17] formalism.

A priori it is not clear that two Lagrangians which are related by a Stueckelberg transformation are equivalent, since such a transformation is not a simple point transformation because it involves derivatives of the unphysical scalar fields; however, within the Hamiltonian formalism this equivalence can be properly shown. In Hamiltonian framework no more "Stueckelberg transformation" is made, instead, one passes from the gauge noninvariant (second-class constrained) system to the gauge invariant (first-class constrained) system by a phase space enlargement followed by an application of the constraints in order to convert the Hamiltonian and the constraints themselves.

In distinction to massive vector fields, massless vector fields necessarily have to be understood as gauge fields. A Lagrangian with massless vector fields but gauge noninvariant interactions of these has no physical meaning because without a gauge-fixing term, which only becomes introduced for gauge invariant Lagrangians (within the Hamiltonian PI formalism as well as within the Lagrangian PI formalism), the operator occurring in the quadratic part of the Lagrangian has no inverse and therefore it is impossible to obtain a propagator for the vector fields. I will present a general proof of the HLE theorem for gauge theories with additional arbitrary (non–Yang–Mills) self interactions of the gauge fields, with arbitrary couplings of the gauge fields to scalar fields and to fermion fields and with arbitrary interactions among the scalar and fermion fields (which are all gauge invariant). The proof also applies to the case of SBGTs, i.e. gauge theories with massive gauge fields, because one can assume that the scalar fields that are coupled to the gauge fields have a nonvanishing vacuum expectation value. In fact, this way one obtains a proof of the HLE theorem for SBGTs alternative to the one announced above which is more direct and which is not based on the Stueckelberg formalism.

Within the Hamiltonian PI formalism, a gauge theory cannot be *directly* quantized in the Lorentz-gauge or, for the case of SBGTs, in the R$_\xi$-gauge (which are the most convenient gauges for practical calculations) because the corresponding g.f. conditions cannot be written as relations among the fields and the conjugate fields alone, and thus they are not g.f. conditions within the Hamiltonian framework. Therefore, I will first derive the generating functional (1.1) with (1.3) in the Coulomb-gauge; due to the equivalence of all gauges [20, 23] this result can then be rewritten in any other gauge.

---

[3] It will be shown later that for the case of this special gauge the Faddeev–Popov formalism yields no explicit g.f. term and ghost term.

When carrying out a complete analysis of the extensions of the standard model, one necessarily has to consider effective interaction terms which depend on higher derivatives [24]. Therefore, I will also derive the HLE theorem for effective Lagrangians with higher derivatives of the fields (effective higher-order Lagrangians). However, theories described by higher-order Lagrangians have quite unsatisfactory properties [25, 26], namely: there are additional degrees of freedom, the energy is unbound from below, the solutions of the equations of motion are not uniquely determined by the initial values of the fields and their first time derivatives and the theory has no analytic limit for $\epsilon \to 0$ (where ϵ denotes the coupling constant of the higher-order interaction term). Clearly, these features are very undesirable when dealing with effective Lagrangians in order to parametrize small deviations from a renormalizable theory like the standard model, in which no unphysical effects occur.

Fortunately however, the abovementioned problems are absent if a higher-order Lagrangian is considered to be an *effective* one. This means, one assumes that there exists a renormalizable theory with heavy particles at an energy scale Λ ("new physics"), and that the effective Lagrangian parametrizes the effects of the "new physics" at an energy scale lower than Λ by expressing the contributions of the heavy particles (which do not explicitely occur in it) through nonrenormalizable effective interactions of the light particles. Supposed that the renormalizable Lagrangian describing the "new physics" does not depend on higher derivatives, it causes no unphysical effects and therefore such effects also do not occur at the lower energy scale, i.e. at the effective-Lagragian level. Actually, I will show in this thesis that in the first order of the effective coupling constant ϵ (with $\epsilon \ll 1$) all higher time derivatives can be eliminated from the effective Lagrangian. Higher powers of ϵ can be neglected because an effective Lagrangian is assumed to describe the effects of well-behaved "new physics" in the $O(\epsilon)$ approximation only; consequently all ill-behaved effects (which do not occur in the first order of ϵ) become cancelled by other $O(\epsilon^n)$ $(n > 1)$ effects of the "new physics".

Each effective higher-order Lagrangian can be reduced to a first-order Lagrangian because one can apply the equations of motion (EOM) to eliminate all higher time derivatives from the effective interaction term (by neglecting higher powers of ϵ). This is a nontrivial statement because, in general, the EOM must not be used to convert the Lagrangian. However, it was shown in [27, 28] that it is possible to find field transformations which have the the same effect as the application of the EOM to the effective interaction term (in the first order of ϵ). I will show that these field transformations are point transformations (and thus canonical transformations) within the Hamiltonian formalism for higher-order Lagrangians (Ostrogradsky formalism [25]) although they involve derivatives of the fields. The reason for this is that within the Ostrogradsky formalism the derivatives up to order $N-1$ are formally treated as independent coordinates if the Lagrangian is of order N, and the order N of the Lagrangian can be chosen arbitrarily without affecting the physical content of the theory [13] (as long as N is greater or equal to the order of the highest actually appearing derivative). This implies that the reduced first-order Lagrangian which is obtained from the primordial higher-order Lagrangian by applying the EOM to its effective interaction term is physically equivalent to this (at the classical and at the quantum level).

In this thesis I will prove the HLE theorem for the case of effective higher-order Lagrangians by reducing them to first-order ones, as explained above, and then applying the HLE theorem for effective Lagrangians with at most first time derivatives of the fields. Especially the treatment of fermion fields can be simplified very much this way because the EOM of these fields only depend on first time derivatives. Therefore one can eliminate not only higher but also first time derivatives of the fermion fields from the effective interaction term and thus it is sufficient to derive the HLE theorem for the case of effective interactions in which no time derivatives of these fields occur. Furthermore, within the Ostrogradsky formalism, the proof of the canonical equivalence of Lagrangians that are related by a Stueckelberg transformation can be generalized to the higher-order case and, besides, it can be simplified very much because, as mentioned above, in this formalism a field transformation which involves derivatives of the fields becomes a canonical transformation.

In the Hamiltonian treatment of effective theories with scalar fields in [10] it is assumed that the effective interaction term is proportional to a small ϵ and in the subsequent procedure higher powers of ϵ are negelected because otherwise it is not possible to find closed expressions for the generalized velocities and the Hamiltonian in terms of the fields and the generalized momenta (if there are higher than second powers of the velocities in the Lagrangian). I will proceed similarly; I will assume that the effective interactions, which are only the *deviations* from the standard interactions (i.e. from the Yang–Mills self-interactions of the vector fields, minimal gauge couplings of these to the scalar and fermion fields, Yukawa couplings of the scalars to the fermions and derivative-free scalar self-interactions), are proportional to a coupling constant[4] ϵ with $\epsilon \ll 1$. In the proof of the HLE theorem I will only consider terms which are at most first order in ϵ, neglecting higher powers[5] of ϵ. This treament is justified when dealing with phenomenologically motivated effective Lagrangians as in [1, 2, 3, 4] since these are considered in order to investigate the effects of *small* deviations from the standard model and since an effective Lagrangian only describes the $O(\epsilon)$-approximation of "new physics" (see above).

It will turn out that the result (1.2) or (1.3) is only correct up to additional quartically divergent terms, i.e. terms proportional to $\delta^4(0)$. According to [10] I will neglect $\delta^4(0)$-terms when establishing the equivalence of Hamiltonian and Lagrangian PI quantization because they become zero in dimensional regularization [10, 29].

Throughout this thesis, I will introduce the source terms in the PI *after* all manipulations will have been done. This is consistent because the source terms for the ghost fields have to be introduced later, anyway. Actually, if the source terms would be considered from the beginning, they would not remain unchanged in the subsequent treatment. However, a change in the source terms does not effect the S-matrix elements [23].

---

[4] In general, effective Lagrangians contain more than one coupling constant in the nonstandard interaction terms. However, this does not affect the results of this thesis because each effective coupling constant ϵ_i can be written as $\epsilon_i = \epsilon g_i$ with $g_i \leq 1$, where $\epsilon \ll 1$ is the same for all ϵ_i.

[5] One should keep in mind that the neglection of higher powers of ϵ is not a restriction to the tree level because one can consider loops in which one vertex follows from the effective interaction term ($\propto \epsilon$) while the other(s) are standard (Yang–Mills) vertices.

This thesis is organized as follows: In chapter 2 I show how the unitary gauge of a spontaneously broken gauge theory can be constructed within the simple Lagrangian path integral formalism, I give an introduction to the Stueckelberg formalism and I apply it in order to show that each effective Lagrangian can be written in a gauge invariant form. Chapter 3 contains a brief review of the dynamics and the Hamiltonian path integral quantization of constrained systems. In chapter 4 I prove the Hamilton–Lagrange equivalence theorem (HLE theorem) for effective interactions of massive vector fields, namely for gauge noninvariant effective Lagrangians and for spontaneously broken gauge theories (with linearly and with nonlinearly realized symmetry) and I reformulate the Stueckelberg formalism within the Hamiltonian framework. In chapter 5 I prove the equivalence of Lagrangians which are related to each other by a field transformation that involves derivatives, I show that a higher-order effective Lagrangian can be reduced to a first-order one by applying the equations of motion to the effective interaction term and I derive the HLE theorem for effective Lagrangians with higher derivatives of the fields. In chapter 6 I present a general proof of the HLE theorem for effective gauge theories. Chapter 7 contains the summary of the results derived in this thesis.

Chapter 2

The Unitary Gauge and the Stueckelberg Formalism

In this chapter I will study the various approaches to the unitary gauge of a spontaneously broken gauge theory within the simple *Lagrangian* (Faddeev–Popov) PI formalism; i.e., I will show how the unphysical scalar fields can be removed from such a theory by quantizing it in this formalism. I will give an introduction to the Stueckelberg formalism and I will utilize it in order to connect gauge noninvariant Lagrangians with massive vector fields (containing standard or nonstandard self-interactions of these) with (linearly or nonlinearly realized) SBGTs.

The treatment of this chapter is a bit aside from the main point of this thesis, namely *Hamiltonian* PI quantiztion, because here all considerations are based on the naive Lagrangian PI ansatz. However, the results obtained in this chapter and the physical methods introduced here (especially the Stueckelberg formalism) are of importance for the Hamiltonian treatment of SBGTs in the following chapters.

SBGTs contain unphysical degrees of freedom, the pseudo-Goldstone scalars. At the classical level, the unphysical fields can be removed by means of a gauge transformation, i.e., for given values of the pseudo-Goldstone fields at each space-time point there exists a gauge transformation (in which the choice of the gauge parameters depends on these values) that maps the unphysical fields identically to zero. This gauge, which is characterized by the fact that the Lagrangian contains only "physical fields", is called the unitary gauge (U-gauge).

However, this naive definition of the U-gauge cannot be applied in quantum physics which is best seen within the framework of Feynman's path integral formalism [6, 7, 8], where quantization is based on the generating functional (1.1). Since the gauge transformation which removes the unphysical fields is dependent on the values of these fields at each space-time point, it cannot be applied to the generating functional where a functional integration over *all* values of the fields is done. In other words there is not a "universal" gauge transformation which maps arbitrary pseudo-Goldstone fields equal to zero.

There are three (equivalent) ways of constructing a gauge without unphysical fields (i.e. without pseudo-Goldstone fields and without ghost fields) within the Lagrangian PI formalism. I discuss them mainly for the case of linearly and minimally realized SBGTs (i.e. those which contain physical Higgs scalars and which are renormalizable). The case of nonlinear and/or nonminimal theories will also be treated at the end of this chapter. The construction of the U-gauge within the correct Hamiltonian PI formalism will be discussed in the chapters 4 and 5 of this thesis.

The first and most direct procedure to construct the U-gauge within the Faddeev–Popov (FP) formalism is simply to impose the gauge-fixing condition that the pseudo-Goldstone fields be equal to zero (which can be done because of the existence of the abovementioned gauge transformation). The resulting FP δ-function is used in order to integrate out the unphysical scalar fields while the FP determinant can be written as an exponential function without introducing ghost fields, which yields a quartically divergent (i.e. proportional to $\delta^4(0)$) nonpolynomial Higgs self-coupling term. Alternatively, the FP determinant can be rewritten as a ghost term with static ghost fields. All ghost loops are quartically divergent and the ghost term can be replaced by the abovementioned Higgs self-interaction term, which has the same effect on physical matrix elements.

The second method is to construct the R_ξ-gauge [20, 23, 30, 31] in which the unphysical fields are still present but with masses proportional to the free parameter $\sqrt{\xi}$, and then to take the limit $\xi \to \infty$. In this limit, the unphysical fields get infinite masses and decouple. However, the ghost-ghost-scalar couplings get infinite, too, with the consequence, that the ghost term does not completely vanish; I will show that some of the ghost loops vanish in this limit and the others become quartically divergent. The contribution of the latter terms yields again the quartically divergent Higgs self-interaction term. The R_ξ-limiting procedure goes back to [31, 32]. I will apply this formalism to an SBGT with only partly broken symmetry, which requires a modification of the R_ξ-gauge, namely the introduction of different parameters ξ corresponding to the massive and to the massless gauge fields.

The third way is most similar to the classical treatment: the unphysical fields are decoupled from the physical ones by applying appropriate field transformations [20]. This procedure consists of two subsequent field transformations; first the unphysical scalars are paramatrized nonlinearly and then they are decoupled and can be integrated out. When making field transformations in the PI, one also has to take into account the Jacobian determinant which arises owing to the change of the functional integration measure [20, 33]; in this case this yields again the abovementioned Higgs self-interaction term.

Thus, all three methods lead to a quantized U-gauge Lagrangian which contains, in addition to the classical U-gauge Lagrangian, an extra nonpolynomial quartically divergent Higgs self-interaction term. The same term was derived by quantizing the classical U-gauge Lagrangian canonically [32, 34] where it emerges as a remnant of covariantization. In section 4.4 I will derive it within the Hamiltonian PI formalism. However, the $\delta^4(0)$-term becomes zero if dimensional regularization is applied [10, 29]. Besides, it was shown in [35, 36], that this term cancels against other quartic divergences arising from vector-boson loops, so that, when summing over all Feynman diagrams, no quartic divergent terms contribute to the S-matrix elements (within a renormalizable theory). Due to the equivalence of all gauges [20, 23], loop calculations can either be carried out within the R_ξ-gauge or within the U-gauge. They seem to be simpler in the U-gauge than in the R_ξ-gauge because there are less Feynman diagrams due to the absence of unphysical fields. On the other hand, the form of the vector-boson propagator in this gauge (which is proportional to the zeroth instead of the inverse second power of the energy) induces higher divergences in the single Feynman diagrams which are, however, cancelled when summing over the different diagrams. These higher divergences do not occur from the beginning if one uses the R$_\xi$-gauge. Furthermore, calculations within the U-gauge suffer from ambiguities in the determination of the finite part of an S-matrix element [30, 37]. Thus, the R$_\xi$-gauge seems to be more adequate for loop calculations than the U-gauge.

Therefore, for practical purposes it is not so useful to remove the unphysical degrees of freedom from an SBGT. Instead, one should go the reverse way, i.e., when dealing with a gauge noninvariant Lagrangian, one should introduce unphysical fields in order to rewrite this theory as an SBGT, which enables the choice of the R$_\xi$-gauge and simplifies loop calculations. Actually, the third of the abovementioned procedures can be reversed, i.e. an SBGT can be "reconstructed" from its (gauge noninvariant) U-gauge Lagrangian. To do this, scalar fields, which are initially completely decoupled, are introduced into the theory by multiplying an (infinite) constant to the generating functional which contains the functional integration over these fields. The unphysical scalars are then coupled to the physical fields by an appropriate field transformation. In the next step unphysical and physical scalar fields together are rewritten in a linearized form. In [21] a formal proof was given that this way each tree unitary Lagrangian can be written as an SBGT. I will explicitly carry out this procedure for the case of the electroweak standard model taking into account the (Lagrangian) PI formalism. This method of constructing SBGTs by such "field-enlarging transformations" represents the non-Abelian version of the Stueckelberg formalism [18, 19, 38, 39], which in its original form was studied only for theories without physical Higgs bosons where it leads to the problem of nonpolynomial interactions and nonrenormalizability (in non-Abelian theories). The existence of physical scalars, however, enables a linearization of the scalar sector, so that renormalizable Stueckelberg models can be constructed.

By applying a Stueckelberg transformation to a simple massive Yang–Mills theory (without physical scalars) one obtains a gauged nonlinear σ-model. I will briefly review and summarize the three different approaches to such a model discussed in the literature, namely the Stueckelberg formalism [19], gauging a nonlinear σ-model [40] (i.e. a model with a global nonlinearly realized spontaneously broken symmetry) and taking the limit $M_H \to \infty$ of a Higgs model [41].

In the electroweak phenomenology effective Lagrangians with extra non–Yang Mills vector-boson self-interactions are considered (see e.g. [1]) in order to parametrize possible deviations from the standard model. Applying a Stueckelbeg transformation to such an effective Lagrangian allows to rewrite it as an SBGT. This result has already been obtained in [22], however without identifying the corresponding transformation as a Stueckelberg transformation. Within the resulting SBGT the gauge group acts nonlinearly on the unphysical fields, there are nonpolynomial interactions and they are nonrenormalizable. However, the gauge freedom enables the choice of the R$_\xi$-gauge (where the vector-boson propagators have a good high-energy behaviour) in order to carry out loop calculations within an effective theory, which shows that the loops in such a theory do not diverge as severely as one would expect by naive power counting. Furthermore I will show that each effective Lagrangian with massive vector bosons can even be extended to an SBGT with *linearly* realized symmetry by introducing a physical Higgs boson. This makes the loop corrections even smaller.

Within this chapter renormalizable SBGTs are discussed by taking the example of the SU(2) × U(1) standard model (SM) of the electroweak interaction [42] since it is of greatest phenomenological interest. Similarly, in the discussion of effective Lagrangians I restrict myself to theories containing the electroweak vector bosons, which leads again to SU(2) × U(1) gauge invariance. However, the results obtained in this chapter can easily be generalized to an arbitrary gauge group.

The results of this chapter were obtained in collaboration with R. Kögerler. They have first been published in [43].

2.1 Preliminaries and Notation

In this section I introduce my notation of the electroweak standard model and of the Faddeev–Popov formalism. For a systematic treatment of these subjects, the reader is referred to the original literature [7, 42] and, especially, to textbooks on quantum field theory and particle physics (e.g. [8]).

The SM gauge fields corresponding to the gauge groups SU(2) and U(1) are W_μ^i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) and B_μ, respectively. For practical purposes the W field is parametrized in terms of a 2×2 matrix:

$$W_\mu \equiv \frac{1}{2} W_\mu^i \tau_i. \tag{2.1}$$

The matrix-valued field strength tensors are

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\mu\nu} &\equiv \partial_\mu W_\nu - \partial_\nu W_\mu + ig[W_\mu, W_\nu], \\ B_{\mu\nu} &\equiv \partial_\mu B_\nu - \partial_\nu B_\mu. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

The scalar fields $\tilde{h}$ and φ_i are parametrized by means of as a 2×2 matrix as well:

$$\Phi \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\tilde{h}\mathbf{1} + i\tau_i\varphi_i). \tag{2.3}$$

Furthermore I consider one fermionic doublet Ψ (the generalization to more doubletts works as usual) consisting of an up-type field u and a down-type field d (quark or lepton)

$$\Psi \equiv \begin{pmatrix} u \\ d \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \Psi_{L,R} \equiv \frac{1}{2}(1 \mp \gamma_5)\Psi \tag{2.4}$$

with the fermion mass matrix

$$M_f \equiv \begin{pmatrix} m_u & 0 \\ 0 & m_d \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.5}$$

With the appropriate covariant derivatives

$$D_\mu \Phi \equiv \partial_\mu \Phi + igW_\mu\Phi - \frac{i}{2}g'\Phi B_\mu \tau_3,$$

$$\begin{aligned} D_\mu \Psi_L &\equiv \left(\partial_\mu + igW_\mu + \frac{i}{2}g'(B-L)B_\mu\right)\Psi_L, \\ D_\mu \Psi_R &\equiv \left(\partial_\mu + \frac{i}{2}g'(\tau_3 + B - L)B_\mu\right)\Psi_R \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

(with B and L being the baryon and lepton number of Ψ), the SM Lagrangian takes the well known form [8, 42]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{SM} &= -\frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{tr}\,(W^{\mu\nu}W_{\mu\nu}) - \frac{1}{4}(B^{\mu\nu}B_{\mu\nu}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{tr}\,\left[(D^\mu\Phi)^\dagger(D_\mu\Phi)\right] - \frac{1}{2}\mu^2\,\mathrm{tr}\,(\Phi\Phi^\dagger) - \frac{1}{4}\lambda\,(\mathrm{tr}\,(\Phi\Phi^\dagger))^2 \\ &\quad + i(\bar\Psi_L\gamma_\mu D^\mu\Psi_L + \bar\Psi_R\gamma_\mu D^\mu\Psi_R) - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{v}(\bar\Psi_L\Phi M_f\Psi_R + \bar\Psi_R M_f\Phi^\dagger\Psi_L) \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

(with $\mu^2 < 0$ and $\lambda > 0$). $\mathcal{L}_{SM}$ is invariant under the local SU(2) × U(1) gauge transformations

$$\begin{aligned} W_\mu &\longrightarrow S(x)W_\mu S^\dagger(x) - \frac{i}{g}S(x)\partial_\mu S^\dagger(x), \\ B_\mu &\longrightarrow B_\mu - \partial_\mu\beta(x), \\ \Phi &\longrightarrow S(x)\Phi\exp\left(-\frac{i}{2}g'\beta(x)\tau_3\right), \\ \Psi_L &\longrightarrow S(x)\exp\left(\frac{i}{2}g'(B-L)\beta(x)\right)\Psi_L, \\ \Psi_R &\longrightarrow \exp\left(\frac{i}{2}g'(\tau_3+B-L)\beta(x)\right)\Psi_R \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

with

$$S(x) \equiv \exp\left(\frac{i}{2}g\alpha_i(x)\tau_i\right), \tag{2.9}$$

(where g and g' are the SU(2) and U(1) coupling constants, respectively). $\alpha_i(x)$ and $\beta(x)$ denote the four gauge parameters. The nonvanishing vacuum expectation value (VEV) of the scalar field Φ (2.3) is

$$\langle\Phi\rangle_0 = \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}\mathbf{1} \quad \text{with} \quad v = \sqrt{\frac{-\mu^2}{\lambda}}. \tag{2.10}$$

The fields

$$h \equiv \tilde{h} - v \tag{2.11}$$

and φ_i have a vanishing VEV. h is the Higgs field and φ_i are the pseudo-Goldstone fields. The physical gauge-boson fields $W_\mu^\pm$, Z_μ and A_μ (photon) are the well known combinations of W_μ^i and B_μ:

$$\begin{aligned} W_\mu^\pm &\equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(W_\mu^1 \mp W_\mu^2\right), \\ Z_\mu &\equiv \cos\theta_W W_\mu^3 - \sin\theta_W B_\mu, \\ A_\mu &\equiv \sin\theta_W W_\mu^3 + \cos\theta_W B_\mu \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

(with θ_W being the Weinberg angle defined by $\tan\theta_W \equiv \frac{g'}{g}$).

In order to quantize the theory one usually starts from the Lagrangian PI ansatz [6, 8]

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}W_\mu^i \mathcal{D}B_\mu \mathcal{D}h \mathcal{D}\varphi_i \mathcal{D}\Psi \mathcal{D}\bar{\Psi} \, \exp\left(i \int d^4x \, \mathcal{L}_{SM}\right). \tag{2.13}$$

Z contains an infinite constant due to the gauge freedom. This is removed within the Faddeev–Popov (FP) formalism [7, 8] by imposing the general gauge-fixing conditions

$$F_a(W_\mu^i, B_\mu, \Phi) = C_a(x), \qquad a = 1, \ldots, 4 \tag{2.14}$$

(where $C_a(x)$ are arbitrary funcions) and then rewriting Z (after dropping the infinite constant) as

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}W_\mu^i \mathcal{D}B_\mu \mathcal{D}h \mathcal{D}\varphi_i \mathcal{D}\Psi \mathcal{D}\bar{\Psi} \, \delta^4[F_a - C_a(x)] \, \mathrm{Det}\left(\frac{\delta F_a(x)}{\delta \alpha_b(y)}\right) \exp\left(i \int d^4x \, \mathcal{L}_{SM}\right) \tag{2.15}$$

($\alpha_a = (\alpha_i, \beta)$). Since (2.15) is independent of the C_a [20], one can construct the weighted average over them (with the weight functions $\exp\left(-\frac{i}{2\xi_a}\int d^4x \, C_a^2\right)$, ξ_a being a set of free parameters[1]). Then one expresses the FP determinant through the ghost fields η_a, η_a^* by using

$$\mathrm{Det}\left(\frac{\delta F_a(x)}{\delta \alpha_b(y)}\right) \propto \int \mathcal{D}\eta_a \mathcal{D}\eta_a^* \, \exp\left(-i \int d^4x d^4y \, \eta_a^*(x) \frac{\delta F_a(x)}{\delta \alpha_b(y)} \eta_b(y)\right). \tag{2.16}$$

As a result, (2.15) can be written as [8, 20, 23, 30, 31]

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}W_\mu^i \mathcal{D}B_\mu \mathcal{D}h \mathcal{D}\varphi_i \mathcal{D}\Psi \mathcal{D}\bar{\Psi} \mathcal{D}\eta_a \mathcal{D}\eta_a^* \, \exp\left(i \int d^4x \, \mathcal{L}_{quant}\right) \tag{2.17}$$

with the quantized Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{quant} &= \mathcal{L}_{SM} - \frac{1}{2\xi_a} F_a^2 - \eta_a^* \frac{\partial F_a}{\partial \alpha_b} \eta_b \\ &\equiv \mathcal{L}_{SM} + \mathcal{L}_{g.f.} + \mathcal{L}_{ghost}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

which contains an additional gauge-fixing term a ghost term[2]. Finally, source terms for all (physical and unphysical) fields have to be introduced.

Later in this thesis I will also consider effective Lagrangians with an additional arbitrary SU(2) × U(1)-invariant interaction term $\mathcal{L}_I$,

$$\mathcal{L}_{eff} = \mathcal{L}_{SM} + \epsilon \mathcal{L}_I. \tag{2.19}$$

Obviously, the g.f. term and the ghost term in (2.18), which only depend on the choice of the g.f. conditions (2.14), remain unchanged if, instead of $\mathcal{L}_{SM}$ (2.7), such a Lagrangian is quantized; i.e. these terms are independent of the form of $\mathcal{L}_I$.

---

[1] Usually all ξ_a are taken to be equal, but for my purposes I allow also different ξ_a.

[2] Note that $\mathcal{L}_{ghost} = -\eta_a^* \frac{\partial F_a}{\partial \alpha_b} \eta_b$ is a convenient shorthand notation for $\mathcal{L}_{ghost} = -\int d^4y \, \eta_a^*(x) \frac{\delta F_a(x)}{\delta \alpha_b(y)} \eta_b(y)$ (which is a local expression because $\frac{\delta F_a(x)}{\delta \alpha_b(y)}$ is proportional to $\delta^4(x-y)$ or its derivatives). This notation will be used throughout this thesis.

2.2 Derivation of the U-Gauge by Gauge Fixing

In this section I explain the “direct way” of constructing the U-gauge within the FP formalism by setting the unphysical pseudo-Goldstone fields equal to zero from the beginning. This is done by imposing the gauge-fixing conditions

$$\begin{aligned} F_i &\equiv \varphi_i = 0, \qquad\qquad i = 1,2,3, \\ F_4 &\equiv \partial_\mu A^\mu = C(x). \end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

This is a possible choice of g.f. conditions since the φ_i can be transformed to zero by means of a gauge transformation. The fourth g.f. condition is necessary because the unbroken symmetry $\mathrm{U(1)_{em}}$ has to be fixed as well. (2.15) now takes the form

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}W^i_\mu \mathcal{D}B_\mu \mathcal{D}h \mathcal{D}\varphi_i \mathcal{D}\Psi \mathcal{D}\bar{\Psi}\, \delta^3[\varphi_i]\delta[\partial_\mu A^\mu - C(x)]\, \mathrm{Det}\left(\frac{\delta F_a(x)}{\delta \alpha_b(y)}\right) \exp\left(i\int d^4x\, \mathcal{L}_{SM}\right). \tag{2.21}$$

Only the second δ-function is treated in the way explained above, yielding an appropriate $\mathcal{L}_{g.f.}$. The other one enables to carry out the $\mathcal{D}\varphi_i$ integration with the result that all terms with pseudo-Goldstone fields in the SM Lagrangian and in the ghost term become equal to zero. Thus, the unphysical pseudo-Goldstone bosons are removed from the theory. The quantized Lagrangian becomes

$$\mathcal{L}_{quant} = \mathcal{L}_{SM}|_{\varphi_i=0} - \frac{1}{2\xi_\gamma}(\partial_\mu A^\mu)^2 + \mathcal{L}_{ghost}|_{\varphi_i=0} \tag{2.22}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{ghost}$ is given by (2.18). Except for $\mathcal{L}_{ghost}$ this is identical to the classical U-gauge Lagrangian with fixed $\mathrm{U(1)_{em}}$.

Let me now consider the ghost term and show that in this gauge also the ghost fields can be removed from the theory. Corresponding to the gauge boson mixing (2.12) I define the parameters

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_Z &= \cos\theta_W \alpha_3 - \sin\theta_W \beta, \\ \alpha_\gamma &= \sin\theta_W \alpha_3 + \cos\theta_W \beta. \end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

From (2.8) one finds the changes of the F_a (2.20) under infinitesimal gauge transformations.

$$\begin{aligned} \delta F_1 &= \delta\varphi_1 = \frac{g}{2}(v+h)\delta\alpha_1 + O(\varphi_i), \\ \delta F_2 &= \delta\varphi_2 = \frac{g}{2}(v+h)\delta\alpha_2 + O(\varphi_i), \\ \delta F_3 &= \delta\varphi_3 = \frac{g}{2\cos\theta_W}(v+h)\delta\alpha_Z + O(\varphi_i), \\ \delta F_4 &= \delta(\partial_\mu A^\mu) = -\Box\delta\alpha_\gamma + O(\varphi_i) + O(W^i_\mu). \end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

First, one can see that all terms which are proportional to the pseudo-Goldstone fields φ_i (denoted as $O(\varphi_i)$) yield vanishing contributions to the ghost terms after integrating out the δ-function, as explained above. Second, η_γ (the ghost belonging to the electromagnetic gauge freedom) is a physically inert field: it is not possible to construct a Feynman diagram with internal η_γ-lines, because (2.24) only yields (besides a kinetic term for η_γ) vertices with outgoing η_γ-lines (and incoming $\eta^\pm$-lines coupled to $W^\pm$) but no vertices with an incoming η_γ. Thus, the field η_γ can be integrated out.

After removing all redundant terms, one can express the resulting FP determinant as

$$\mathrm{Det}\left(\frac{\delta F_a(x)}{\delta\alpha_b(y)}\right) = \mathrm{Det}\left(\frac{g}{2}(v+h)\,\mathrm{diag}\left[1,1,\frac{1}{\cos\theta_W}\right]\delta^4(x-y)\right). \tag{2.25}$$

Since the argument of the determinant has the simple form $M_{ab}(x)\delta^4(x-y)$, one can express the functional determinant ("Det") in terms of the ordinary one ("det") by using the relation [33]

$$\mathrm{Det}\left(M_{ab}(x)\delta^4(x-y)\right) = \exp\left[\delta^4(0)\int d^4x\,\ln(\det M_{ab}(x))\right]. \tag{2.26}$$

Thus one finds

$$\mathrm{Det}\left(\frac{\delta F_a(x)}{\delta\alpha_b(y)}\right) = \exp\left(i\int dx\left(-3i\delta^4(0)\ln\left(1+\frac{h}{v}\right) - i\delta^4(0)\ln\frac{g^3v^3}{8\cos\theta_W}\right)\right). \tag{2.27}$$

This means that in this case (in contrast to the R$_\xi$ gauge, where the argument of the FP determinant contains derivatives of the δ-function and thus (2.26) cannot be applied) the FP determinant can be written as an exponential function without introducing unphysical ghost fields. As a result one finds (neglecting a constant and using $M_W = \frac{vg}{2}$) the ghostless FP term to the Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L}_{ghost} = -3i\delta^4(0)\ln\left(1+\frac{g}{2M_W}h\right). \tag{2.28}$$

(2.22) with (2.28) shows that $\mathcal{L}_{quant}$ (in the gauge defined by (2.20)) contains no unphysical fields, neither pseudo-Goldstone nor ghost fields[3]. Instead, there is the extra term (2.28) describing a quartically divergent nonpolynomial Higgs self-interaction.

The extra term (2.28) can alternatively be derived from the Feynman diagrams obtained by applying (2.16) in order to express the determinant (2.25) in terms of usual ghost fields. I am going now to present also this derivation, since it makes the role of the new interaction term more transparent. In this procedure the ghost term is (with $\eta^\pm = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\eta_1 \mp i\eta_2)$)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{ghost} \;=\; & -M_W\eta^{+*}\eta^+ - M_W\eta^{-*}\eta^- - M_Z\eta_Z^*\eta_Z \\ & -\frac{g}{2}\eta^{+*}\eta^+h - \frac{g}{2}\eta^{-*}\eta^-h - \frac{g}{2\cos\theta_W}\eta_Z^*\eta_Z h.\end{aligned} \tag{2.29}$$

There are no kinetic terms of the ghost fields, only mass terms and couplings to the Higgs boson. This means that the ghost propagators are static ones, i.e. inverse masses. Figure 2.1 shows the Feynman rules derived from (2.29). Since the ghost fields exclusively couple to

---

[3] If the unbroken subgroup is non-Abelian the ghost fields belonging to this subgroup are still present. These can be removed by choosing the axial gauge $t_\mu A_b^\mu = C_b(x)$ for the massless gauge bosons instead of the Lorentz gauge as in (2.20).

Figure 2.1: Feynman rules obtained from the ghost term (2.29) in the U-gauge. In all figures the solid lines represent the Higgs lines and the dotted ones the ghost lines.

Figure 2.2: Ghost loop connected to N Higgs lines contributing to the Feynman diagrams in the U-gauge. The internal ghosts may be $\eta^{\pm}$ or η_Z.

the Higgs boson, they only contribute to Feynman diagrams with ghost loops connected to an arbitrary number of Higgs lines (Figure 2.2), which can be internal or external ones. The Feynman rules (Fig. 2.1) imply that the contribution of such a loop with N ghost propagators coupled to N Higgs bosons to the amplitude is (with a factor $(2\pi)^{-4}$ for the loop and one (-1) due to the Fermi statistics of the ghosts)

$$-\int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4}\left(-\frac{g}{2M_W}\right)^N = -\delta^4(0)\left(-\frac{g}{2M_W}\right)^N \tag{2.30}$$

for an internal $\eta^{\pm}$ as well as for an internal η_Z. One can see that such a ghost loop effectively provides for a quartically divergent N-Higgs self-coupling. Let me for a moment go to the one-loop level (where the Higgs lines connected to the ghost loop are “tree lines”) and consider all subdiagrams like Fig. 2.2 with a fixed number N of Higgs lines. The sum of

Figure 2.3: Extra quartically divergent N-Higgs-boson vertex.

their contributions is

$$-3\delta^4(0)(N-1)!\left(-\frac{g}{2M_W}\right)^N . \tag{2.31}$$

The factor 3 is due to the three types of internal ghosts and the factor $(N-1)!$ is due to the $(N-1)!$ different possibilities to attach the N Higgs lines to such a loop (as one can easily verify by induction). Thus all the ghost loops with N Higgs lines together can be replaced by an extra N-Higgs vertex (Figure 2.3) with the quartically divergent vertex factor (2.31). Considering a combinatorical factor of $1/N!$ due to the $N!$ different possibilities to attach N Higgs lines to the such a vertex, all the extra N-Higgs vertices (with all possible values of N) can be derived from the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_{extra} = 3i\delta^4(0)\sum_{N=1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{1}{N}\left(-\frac{g}{2M_W}\right)^N h^N\right) = -3i\delta^4(0)\ln\left(1+\frac{g}{2M_W}h\right), \tag{2.32}$$

which is identical to (2.28).

This one-loop derivation can easily be generalized to all loop orders without changing the result: If the Higgs lines in Figs. 2.2 and 2.3 are not "tree lines" but connected to loops among themselves or to other ghost loops or extra vertices of this type, the only thing in the above discussion that changes is the combinatorics. However, the combinatorical factors of $(N-1)!$ for the N-Higgs ghost-loop and of $N!$ for the N-Higgs vertex change by the same extra factor so that this cancels. One can easily see that, no matter how the Higgs lines are connected, for each way to attach N Higgs lines to a loop like Fig. 2.2 there are N ways to attach them to a vertex like Fig. 2.3, corresponding to the N cyclic permutations.

This alternative derivation of the extra term (2.28) to the quantized Lagrangian (although it is more elaborate) shows explicitly the meaning of (2.28): $\delta^4(0)$ has to be interpreted as a quartically divergent integral stemming from (2.30) and can be expressed in terms of a cut-off[4] Λ as $\frac{\Lambda^4}{(2\pi)^4}$ and the logarithm has to be evaluated in a power series as in (2.32) which yields a (nonpolynomial) self-interaction of an arbitrary number of Higgs bosons. One can see that the unphysical ghost fields can effectively be removed from the theory by taking the U-gauge but they do not completely decouple (as the pseudo-Goldstone fields do): there remains the additional interaction term (2.28) as a remnant. However there are no more explicit ghost fields in this term.

---

[4] Remember that $\delta^4(0)$ vanishes in dimensional regularization [10, 29].

Remembering the last paragraph of the preceding section, one can easily generalize this result to the quantization of an effective Lagrangian with an additional arbitrary (but gauge invariant) interaction term (2.19). The quantized U-gauge Lagrangian turns out to be

$$\mathcal{L}_{quant} = \mathcal{L}_{eff}\Big|_{\varphi_i=0} - \frac{1}{2\xi_\gamma}(\partial_\mu A^\mu)^2 + \mathcal{L}_{extra} \tag{2.33}$$

with the same $\mathcal{L}_{extra}$ (2.28) as in the SM case (due to the independence of the ghost term from the effective interaction term). This result will be used when deriving the HLE theorem for effective SBGTs later in this thesis.

2.3 R$_\xi$-Limiting Procedure

The second approach to the unitary gauge is to start from the SM quantized in the R$_\xi$-gauge and then to take the limit $\xi \to \infty$. To construct this limit, one has to modify the R$_\xi$-gauge a bit because the photon propagator

$$i\frac{-g^{\mu\nu} + (1-\xi)\dfrac{p^\mu p^\nu}{p^2}}{p^2} \tag{2.34}$$

would become infinite for $\xi \to \infty$, while the propagator of the massive gauge bosons

$$i\frac{-g^{\mu\nu} + (1-\xi)\dfrac{p^\mu p^\nu}{p^2 - \xi M_B^2}}{p^2 - M_B^2}, \tag{2.35}$$

($M_B = M_W$ or M_Z) remains finite in this limit. I impose the usual R$_\xi$ gauge-fixing conditions [8, 20, 23, 30, 31] and express them in terms of the mass eigenstates A^μ and Z^μ of the neutral sector (instead of W_3^μ and B^μ):

$$\begin{aligned} F_{1,2} &\equiv \partial_\mu W^\mu_{1,2} - \xi M_W \varphi_{1,2} = C_{1,2}(x), \\ F_3 &\equiv \partial_\mu Z^\mu - \xi M_Z \varphi_3 = C_3(x), \\ F_4 &\equiv \partial_\mu A^\mu = C_4(x). \end{aligned} \tag{2.36}$$

In order to obtain the corresponding $\mathcal{L}_{g.f.}$ I make use of the possibility to introduce different parameters ξ_a for each F_a ($a = 1, \ldots, 4$) in the g.f. term in (2.18) (see footnote 1 of this chapter). The $\mathcal{L}_{g.f.}$ most convenient for my purposes is

$$\mathcal{L}_{g.f.} = -\frac{1}{2\xi}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{2}(\partial_\mu W_i^\mu - \xi M_W \varphi_i)^2 + (\partial_\mu Z^\mu - \xi M_Z \varphi_3)^2\right] - \frac{1}{2\xi_\gamma}(\partial_\mu A^\mu)^2 \tag{2.37}$$

with *two* free parameters ξ and ξ_γ. The ghost term depends only on ξ since (2.36) depends only on ξ, thus the sole difference between this gauge and the usual R$_\xi$-gauge is that ξ in the photon propagator is replaced by ξ_γ. Now one can take the limit $\xi \to \infty$ [31, 32] (which does not affect physical observables since these do not depend on ξ [20, 23]) while the unbroken subgroup $\mathrm{U}(1)_{\mathrm{em}}$ is fixed in an arbitrary gauge specified by a finite ξ_γ so that the photon propagator remains finite.

A complete list of Feynman rules for the R_ξ-gauged SM is, e.g., given in the book of Bailin and Love [8]. The ξ-dependent propagators and vertices are:

- The propagators of the massive gauge bosons (2.35), which become Proca propagators of massive spin-one particles for infinite ξ. Thus, the contribution of those parts of the g.f. term, which are quadratic in the massive gauge fields, vanishes in this limit.
- The propagators of the pseudo-Goldstone bosons and of the ghost fields (except for η_γ, which is massless)

  $$i \frac{1}{p^2 - \xi M_B^2}. \tag{2.38}$$

  For $\xi \to \infty$, these particles acquire infinite mass and their propagators become zero. If there would be no ξ-dependent vertices these particles would completely decouple.
- All couplings of a (physical or unphysical) scalar to a ghost pair. These are proportional to ξ and become infinite for $\xi \to \infty$.

Now I examine which Feynman diagrams with lines corresponding to unphysical fields do not vanish for $\xi \to \infty$. Since the pseudo-Goldstone and the $\eta^\pm, \eta_Z$ propagators behave as ξ^{-1} for large ξ their number has to equal the number of scalar–ghost–ghost vertices ($\propto \xi$) in such diagrams. This means:

- All propagators $\propto \xi^{-1}$ have to be coupled to ξ-dependent vertices at *both* ends, i.e., couplings of unphysical fields to gauge fields or to fermion fields (which are independent of ξ) do not contribute in this limit.
- Only those ξ-dependent vertices yield nonvanishing contributions which couple to two ξ-dependent and one ξ-independent propagator. These are the $h\eta\eta^*$ and the $\varphi^\pm\eta^{\pm *}\eta_\gamma$ vertices. However, the latter do not contribute, since they exist only with an incoming η_γ but not with an outgoing one, thus it is not possible to construct ghost loops with them.

As a consequence, all graphs with pseudo-Goldstone lines or with η_γ-lines vanish for $\xi \to \infty$. Thus, the φ_i-fields and the ghost field η_γ can be neglected altogether in this limit. This means that the only nonvanishing diagrams containing unphysical particles are those with ghost loops that are exclusively coupled to Higgs bosons (Fig. 2.2), i.e. the same diagrams which contribute within the alternative derivation of the U-gauge in the previous section. The corresponding Feynman rules in the R_ξ-gauge are given in Fig. 2.4.

The contribution of such a loop with N external Higgs lines for $\xi \to \infty$ is (for internal $\eta^\pm$ as for η_Z)

$$-\lim_{\xi\to\infty} \int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4} \left(-\frac{i}{2}\xi g M_W\right)^N \prod_{i=1}^{N} \frac{i}{p_i^2 - \xi M_W^2}$$

Figure 2.4: Feynman rules for Fig. 2.2 in the R_ξ-gauge.

$$= -\int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4} \left(-\frac{g}{2M_W}\right)^N = -\delta^4(0) \left(-\frac{g}{2M_W}\right)^N . \tag{2.39}$$

(The momenta p_i of the internal ghosts do not have to be specified to construct the limit.) This is identical to (2.30); therefore one can transfer the discussion of the previous section and finds for the limit of the ghost term

$$\lim_{\xi\to\infty} \mathcal{L}_{ghost} = -3i\delta^4(0) \ln\left(1 + \frac{g}{2M_W}h\right) , \tag{2.40}$$

which is again the extra term (2.28).

Thus in the R_ξ-gauge, after taking the limit $\xi \to \infty$, the pseudo-Goldstone fields and even the massless ghost field η_γ (which has a ξ-independent propagator) decouple completely, while the effects of the massive ghosts can be expressed through the (ghostless) extra interaction term (2.28). Therefore I obtain the same result for the U-gauge Lagrangian as in the previous section[5].

2.4 Decoupling the Unphysical Scalars

In this section I derive the U-gauge of the SM by applying appropriate field transformations to the gauge invariant Lagrangian (2.7). I start with reparametrizing (point transforming) the scalar sector of the theory, (2.3) with (2.11), nonlinearly as [20, 44]:

$$\Phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}((v+h)\mathbf{1} + i\tau_i\varphi_i) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v+\rho)\exp\left(i\frac{\zeta_i\tau_i}{v}\right) . \tag{2.41}$$

Here, ρ is the new Higgs field and the ζ_i are the new pseudo-Goldstone fields. One can see that in this parametrization the Lagrangian (2.7) contains nonpolynomial interactions of the ζ_i to the gauge bosons and to the fermions, which stem from expanding the exponential in the kinetic term of Φ and in the Yukawa term. At the quantum level this is not the whole story: The basis of quantization is not the Lagrangian (2.7) but the PI (2.13). Therefore one has to transform the integration measure in the PI, too, which yields a functional Jacobian determinant [20, 33] according to

---

[5] Actually, it is a priori not clear that the limit $\xi \to \infty$ can be taken *before* the loop integration in (2.39). The fact that the obtained result is identical to that of the alternative derivations justifies this treatment.

$$\mathcal{D}h\mathcal{D}\varphi_i = \mathcal{D}\rho\mathcal{D}\zeta_i \ \mathrm{Det}\,\frac{\delta(h,\varphi_i)}{\delta(\rho,\zeta_i)}. \tag{2.42}$$

The explicit form of the field transformation (2.41) is

$$\begin{aligned} h &= (v+\rho)\cos\tilde{\zeta} - v, \\ \varphi_i &= (v+\rho)\hat{\zeta}_i \sin\tilde{\zeta} \end{aligned} \tag{2.43}$$

(with $\zeta \equiv \sqrt{\zeta_1^2+\zeta_2^2+\zeta_3^2}$, $\hat{\zeta}_i \equiv \zeta_i/\zeta$ and $\tilde{\zeta} \equiv \zeta/v$). One can again use (2.26) in order to express the functional Jacobian determinant in terms of the ordinary one, wich is given by

$$\det\frac{\partial(h,\varphi_i)}{\partial(\rho,\zeta_i)} = (v+\rho)^3\frac{\sin^2\tilde{\zeta}}{v\zeta^2}. \tag{2.44}$$

With (2.26) one finds that the change of the functional intergration measure yields the following extra term to the Lagrangian (after dropping a constant)

$$\mathcal{L}' = -3i\delta^4(0)\ln\left(1+\frac{g}{2M_W}\rho\right) - i\delta^4(0)\ln\left(\frac{\sin^2\tilde{\zeta}}{\tilde{\zeta}^2}\right). \tag{2.45}$$

The first term is again the quartically divergent nonpolynomial Higgs self-coupling term (2.28), but there is also a quartically divergent nonpolynomial self-interaction term of the nonlinearly realized pseudo-Goldstone fields.

Introducing the field combination

$$U \equiv \exp\left(i\frac{\zeta_i\tau_i}{v}\right), \tag{2.46}$$

one can deduce from (2.8) the behaviour of ρ and ζ_i under SU(2) × U(1) gauge transformations:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &\longrightarrow \rho, \\ U &\longrightarrow S(x)U\exp(-\frac{i}{2}g'\beta(x)\tau_3), \end{aligned} \tag{2.47}$$

i.e., the physical scalar ρ is a singlet. Consequently, the first term in (2.45) is gauge invariant while the second is not. However, this is no serious problem since gauge invariance is not really destroyed, it is just not completely obvious due to the nonlinear parametrization[6].

---

[6] This can easily be visualized with the help of an example from quantum mechanics: If one studies a translational invariant Lagrangian and transforms the functional intergration measure to polar coordinates, one finds a translational noninvariant extra term to the Lagrangian although physics is still translational invariant.

In order to remove the unphysical scalar fields ζ_i from the theory one could apply one of the methods described in the previous two sections. I do not explain this in detail here but only mention the main features. If one imposes the gauge-fixing conditions (2.20) (U-gauge) or (2.36) (R_ξ-gauge) with φ_i replaced by ζ_i one finds expressions for the ghost term analogous to those obtained in sections 2.2 and 2.3, except that there are additional interactions of more than one pseudo-Golstone boson with the ghost fields (which do not affect the discussion) and that there are no couplings of the Higgs boson to the ghosts, because from (2.47) it is obvious that the changes of the ζ_i (2.47), and therefore also those of the F_a (2.20) or (2.36), under infinitesimal gauge transformations do not depend on ρ. Thus no ghost loops as in Figure 2.2 can be constructed. Remembering the discussion of the previous sections, one can see that the ghost term vanishes completely after integrating out $\int \mathcal{D}\zeta_i \, \delta^3(\zeta_i)$ in the first case and after taking the limit $\xi \to \infty$ in the second case.

Here I choose another possibility and apply one further field transformation, which affects the vector and the fermion fields. It is just a reversed (non-Abelian) Stueckelberg transformation [19, 20, 21, 39]:

$$\begin{aligned} w_\mu &= U^\dagger W_\mu U - \frac{i}{g} U^\dagger \partial_\mu U, \\ b_\mu &= B_\mu, \\ \psi_L &= U^\dagger \Psi_L, \\ \psi_R &= \Psi_R. \end{aligned} \tag{2.48}$$

The Jacobian of this transformation is independent of the physical fields since (2.48) is linear in them. With (2.26) it yields the (gauge noninvariant) extra term

$$\mathcal{L}'' = -4i\delta^4(0) \ln(\sin^6 \tilde{\zeta} + \cos^6 \tilde{\zeta}) \tag{2.49}$$

to the Lagrangian.

Applying (2.41) and (2.48) to the SM Lagrangian (2.7), one can easily convince oneself that the ζ_i decouple from the physical fields. The resulting Lagrangian turns out to be the one obtained by removing all pseudo-Goldstone fields from (2.7) and by replacing the fields $(W_\mu^i, B_\mu, \Psi, \rho)$ by $(w_\mu^i, b_\mu, \psi, \rho)$. Therefore one can integrate out the pseudo-Goldstone fields in the PI, which yields a constant factor

$$\int \mathcal{D}\,\zeta_i \exp\left(i \int d^4x \, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}\right) \tag{2.50}$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ contains the self couplings of the ζ_i in (2.45) and (2.49):

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}} = -i\delta^4(0) \left(\ln\left(\frac{\sin^2 \tilde{\zeta}}{\tilde{\zeta}^2} \right) + 4 \ln(\sin^6 \tilde{\zeta} + \cos^6 \tilde{\zeta}) \right). \tag{2.51}$$

The expression (2.50) can be removed by multiplying the PI with the compensating factor.

In summary one can see that the unphysical fields ζ_i have decoupled and one obtains the same result for the quantized U-gauge Lagrangian as in the previous two sections; in particular the extra term (2.28) is again recovered.

Next I study the behaviour of the new fields under gauge transformations. With (2.8), (2.47), and (2.48) one finds that all physical fields are invariant under the action of SU(2) and transform under U(1) as

$$\begin{aligned} w_\mu &\rightarrow \exp\left(\frac{i}{2}g'\beta(x)\tau_3\right) w_\mu \exp\left(-\frac{i}{2}g'\beta(x)\tau_3\right) - \frac{1}{2}\frac{g'}{g}\partial_\mu\beta(x)\tau_3, \\ b_\mu &\rightarrow b_\mu - \partial_\mu\beta(x), \\ \rho &\rightarrow \rho, \\ \psi_{L,R} &\rightarrow \exp\left(\frac{i}{2}g'(\tau_3 + B - L)\beta(x)\right)\psi_{L,R}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.52}$$

Introducing, in analogy to (2.12), the mass and charge eigenstates $w^\pm_\mu$, z_μ and a_μ and rescaling the gauge parameter $\beta(x)$ as

$$e\kappa(x) \equiv g'\beta(x) \tag{2.53}$$

(with e being the electromagnetic coupling constant $e = g\sin\theta_W$) one finds

$$\begin{aligned} w^\pm_\mu &\rightarrow \exp(\pm ie\kappa(x))w^\pm_\mu, \\ z_\mu &\rightarrow z_\mu, \\ a_\mu &\rightarrow a_\mu - \partial_\mu\kappa(x), \\ \rho &\rightarrow \rho, \\ \psi &\rightarrow \exp(ieQ_f\kappa(x))\psi, \end{aligned} \tag{2.54}$$

where Q_f is the fermion charge matrix

$$Q_f = \begin{pmatrix} q_u & 0 \\ 0 & q_d \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2}(\tau_3 + B - L). \tag{2.55}$$

This is just an electromagnetic gauge transformation[7]. Thus, after the fields have been parametrized such that all pseudo-Goldstone bosons decouple, the action of the whole gauge group on the physical fields reduces to a gauge transformation belonging to the unbroken subgroup. The remaining gauge freedom is only connected to the unphysical scalars and has been "removed" by dropping (2.50). Finally, the $\mathrm{U}(1)_{\mathrm{em}}$ gauge freedom has to be fixed by adding the g.f. term

$$\mathcal{L}_{g.f.} = -\frac{1}{2\xi_\gamma}\partial_\mu a^\mu, \tag{2.56}$$

while the corresponding ghost field decouples. Thus, one finally finds the same quantized Lagrangian as in the previous two sections.

This derivation of the U-gauge is similar to the classical procedure, i.e. the removal of the pseudo-Goldstone scalars by a means of a gauge transformation. In fact the Stueckelberg transformation (2.48) *formally* acts as an SU(2) gauge transformation on the vector and fermion fields with the gauge parameters α_i being replaced by the the pseudo-Goldstone fields $-\zeta_i/M_W$. But there remains a principal difference between a gauge transformation and a Stueckelberg transformation; namely the gauge transformation which maps the ζ_i identically to zero depends on the numerical values of these fields at the various space-time points and thus it is not the same transformation for different functions ζ_i. The Stuekkelberg transformation (2.48), however, decouples the pseudo-Goldstone fields independently of their functional form from the physical fields and thus it can be applied to the PI, where an integration over the $\zeta_i(x)$ at each space-time point x is carried out. The only effect of quantum physics on the above discussion is the need of transforming the functional integration measure, too. The corresponding Jacobian determinant gives rise to the extra term (2.28).

---

[7] On the first look this result seems surprising since I made a $\mathrm{U}(1)_{\mathrm{Y}}$ transformation to derive (2.54). However, due to the field transformation (2.48), this acts differently on the transformed fields than on the original ones; so it becomes a $\mathrm{U}(1)_{\mathrm{em}}$ transformation.

2.5 The Stueckelberg Formalism

The procedure of the last section can be reversed: one can start from the U-gauge Lagrangian and construct the corresponding SBGT by subsequent field transformations. Although it is clear from the previous section what do to, I explain this procedure a bit more in detail, since it is a "derivation" of an SBGT (e.g. of the SM), which illustrates some features of such a model quite well. Furthermore, the U-gauge Lagrangian of an SBGT can be motivated on a rather intuitive basis: it only involves "physical" fields (i.e. all the fields corresponding to observable particles) and it is the most general Lagrangian without unphysical fields which guarantees tree-unitarity (i.e., N-particle S-matrix elements calculated at the tree level decrease at least as E^{4-N} for high energy E) [21, 36, 45]. Therefore, it seems interesting to look whether and how the general (gauge invariant) structure of an SBGT can be reconstructed from its U-gauge Lagrangian. Tree unitarity implies, in particular, the need of physical scalars (Higgs bosons) with appropriate couplings to the other particles and to itself in order to ensure good high-energy behaviour. It is clear that the extra term (2.28), which genuinely reflects quantum effects, is not obtained from tree-level arguments, but it is inferred from the requirement of vanishing quartically divergent N-Higgs self-couplings (which was shown for $N = 3, 4$ at the one-loop level in [35, 36]). In the following I take the term (2.28) as a given part of the U-gauge Lagrangian.

Starting from this full U-gauge Lagrangian (containing the fields w^i_μ, b_μ, ρ and ψ as in the previous section) one first recognizes the local $\mathrm{U(1)_{em}}$ symmetry (2.54). Applying the FP procedure reversely to the unbroken subgroup, one can remove the corresponding g. f. term (2.56) (and the ghost term if the unbroken subgroup is non-Abelian). Next, one can see that the Lagrangian is gauge invariant also under the larger group SU(2) × U(1) except for the mass terms of the vector bosons and the fermions and the couplings of the physical scalar to these fields. In order to obtain a gauge invariant Lagrangian, one can now use the Stueckelberg formalism. The purpose of the Stueckelberg formalism is to introduce, by field-enlarging transformations, unphysical degrees of freedom with an appropriate behaviour under SU(2)×U(1) gauge transformations that compensate the effect of the transformations of the physical fields in the gauge noninvariant terms of the U-gauge

Lagrangian [18, 19, 21, 38, 39].

In the Lagrangian PI formalism, the field-enlarging transformation is constructed as follows: First one introduces the completely decoupled fields ζ_i by formally multiplying the (infinite) constant (2.50) to the PI. This contains the functional integration over the unphysical fields ζ_i (Stueckelberg scalars) and an exponential function, which is needed to remove the Jacobian determinant of the subsequent field transformations. Then the ζ_i, parametrized in terms of the unitary matrix U (2.46), are coupled to the physical fields by the transformations (2.48). The resulting Lagrangian is invariant under $\mathrm{SU}(2)\times\mathrm{U}(1)$ gauge transformations, (2.8) and (2.47), (except for the extra term (2.51)), because the fields in the U-gauge Lagrangian have been replaced by the combinations (2.48) and the effect of an arbitrary gauge transformation on these is just an electromagnetic one (2.54) which leaves the U-gauge Lagrangian unchanged. Since the Stueckelberg transformation (2.48) has the form of an SU(2) gauge transformation[8], its effect on the kinetic terms, the vector-boson self-interaction terms and the vector-boson–fermion interaction terms is just to replace w^i_μ by W^i_μ, etc. (because these terms are already gauge invariant), while the mass and Higgs coupling terms give rise to a kinetic term of the ζ_i (stemming from the gauge-boson mass-term) and to nonpolynomial couplings of the Stueckelberg scalars to the physical particles. Thereby these terms have become replaced by gauge invariant expressions.

Two important points should be mentioned here.

- In the Stueckelberg formalism spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB) is implied by the parametrization of the unphysical scalar fields in terms of the unitary matrix U (2.46). This yields the constraint
  $$UU^\dagger = \mathbf{1} \tag{2.57}$$
  in the scalar sector, which implies the nonvanishing VEV
  $$\langle U\rangle_0 = \mathbf{1}. \tag{2.58}$$
  This VEV does not follow from a scalar self-interaction potential with a minimum for nonvanishing fields as in the Higgs mechanism.
- In the Stueckelberg formalism the origin of the (seemingly) bad high-energy behaviour of the U-gauge Lagrangian is shifted from the massive-vector-boson propagator, which can now be expressed within to the R_ξ-gauge as (2.35), to the nonpolynomial interactions of the unphysical scalars.

In the original Stueckelberg formalism this is the end of the story because field transformations like (2.48) are not applied to the U-gauge of a (linearly realized) SBGT but to a Yang–Mills theory with mass terms added by hand. The Stueckelberg formalism transforms such a model to a gauged nonlinear σ-model, which is in fact nonrenormalizable [41, 46], since it is not possible to reparametrize the unphycal scalars (2.46) in a linear form in order to avoid nonpolynomial interactions [47]. However, in this case the primordial Lagrangian contains an extra Higgs field (or several Higgs fields in the case of more extended theories). This has been introduced in order to ensure good high-energy behaviour at the tree level and, in fact, it makes the model renormalizable, too, since *physical and unphysical scalar fields together* can be rewritten as a linear expression by means of the field transformation (2.41). (The Jacobian determinant of (2.41) removes the extra term (2.28).) Thus, in the linear parametrization (2.3) with (2.11) the nonpolynomial interactions have been removed. It was shown in [21] that for each tree unitary theory such a linearizing transformation exists, although this transformation has not explicitly been constructed there.

---

[8] In [38] one can find an alternative formulation of the Stueckelberg formalism for the case of $\mathrm{SU}(2)\times\mathrm{U}(1)$ symmetry. There the Stueckelberg transformation does not look like an SU(2) gauge transformation, as in my treatment, but like a full $\mathrm{SU}(2)\times\mathrm{U}(1)$ transformation with the gauge parameters being replaced by unphysical scalar fields; thus *four* unphysical fields are introduced. However, one can show that there exists a reparametrization of the scalar fields (i.e. one more field transformation) that decouples one of these, so that one finally obtains the same result as I do.

Let me briefly discuss the origin of the scalar self-interaction term

$$-V(\Phi) = -\frac{1}{2}\mu^2 \,\mathrm{tr}\,(\Phi\Phi^\dagger) - \frac{1}{4}\lambda\,(\mathrm{tr}\,(\Phi\Phi^\dagger))^2 \tag{2.59}$$

in the SM Lagrangian (2.7) (which implies the nonvanishing VEV and thus the SSB) within this derivation of the SM. The self interactions of the physical Higgs field h are already present in the U-gauge Lagrangian, they are necessary to ensure tree unitarity [45]. However, the VEV of h is zero. The nonvanishing VEV and the unphysical scalar fields become introduced in the Stueckelberg formalism (i.e. by rewriting the theory in a gauge invariant form which implies SSB through the constraint (2.57)). In the linear parametrization of the scalar sector, the Higgs scalar becomes "coupled" to the VEV and to the Stueckelberg scalars, so that one finally obtains $V(\Phi)$ (2.59). One can see that is this derivation of a Higgs model, the Higgs boson with its self-interactions and the SSB become introduced at different stages of the procedure.

So finally one has "recovered" the SM from its unitary gauge by applying appropriate transformations to the physical fields. At the level of the classical Lagrangian, this has originally been done in [21]. At the quantum level one has to consider the PI (2.13), so that two new features arise:

- Field enlarging is easily achieved by multiplying an infinite constant (as (2.50)) to the PI.
- The (quantized) U-gauge Lagrangian has to contain the extra term (2.28). This cancels against the Jacobian determinant which arises as a consequence of the transformation of the functional integration measure.

As the result of this section one can see that a Higgs model can be derived from the requirement of good high-energy behaviour of tree-level amplitudes and of loops without explicitly using the Higgs mechanism (although SSB is implicitly included in this derivation). Thus, the physical sector of an SBGT "contains" the entire model. Non-Abelian Stueckelberg models are renormalizable if, in addition to the unphysical Stueckelberg scalars, also physical scalars with appropriate couplings to the other particles and themselves are present.

2.6 The Gauged Nonlinear σ-Model

As mentioned before, the original purpose of the Stueckelberg formalism was to construct gauge theories with massive gauge bosons but without physical scalars [18, 19, 38, 39, 47]. To construct a (non-Abelian) Stueckelberg model one starts from a Yang-Mills theory, adds a mass term by hand, thereby breaking gauge invariance explicitly, and then makes a field-enlarging Stueckelberg transformation as (2.48) in order to restore gauge invariance. As pointed out in the previous sections, the Stueckelberg transformation only affects the mass term in a nontrivial way thereby yielding, besides a kinetic term for the Stueckelberg scalars, nonpolynomial interactions of the unphysical fields with the physical fields. In the Yang–Mills part of the Lagrangian the original physical fields are simply replaced by the transformed fields. Thus, the addition of unphysical scalar fields with suitable nonpolynomial couplings to the physical fields (in the non-Abelian case) embeds the original massive Yang–Mills theory in an equivalent gauge theory. The resulting model is a gauged nonlinear σ-model. As it is well known, such a model can be constructed in three alternative ways (explained here for the case of SU(2) × U(1) symmetry):

- By applying a Stueckelberg transformation (2.48) to a massive Yang–Mills theory [19] as explained above.
- By gauging a nonlinear σ-model [40], i.e. a model which contains scalar fields parametrized in terms of a unitary matrix U (2.46) and is symmetric with respect to *global* transformation such as (2.47). This global symmetry is spontaneously broken due to the constraint (2.57). The gauged nonlinear σ-model is obtained by coupling U minimally to gauge fields so that the global symmetry becomes a *local* one.
- By formally taking the limit $M_H \to \infty$ of a Higgs model [41]. In this limit the linearly realized scalar fields Φ become substituted by

$$\Phi \to \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} U \tag{2.60}$$

  (with Φ and U given by (2.3). (2.11) and (2.46)). This automatically removes the scalar self-interaction term (2.59) and implies the constraint (2.57).

Although the gauged nonlinear σ-model is nonrenormalizable due to the nonpolynomial interactions, the gauge freedom enables perturbative calculations in the R_ξ-gauge and so one finds that the loops do not diverge as severely as one would expect from naive power counting. In fact, the one-loop divergences of the gauged nonlinear σ-model are only logarithmically cut-off dependent [41].

2.7 Effective Lagrangians

During the last years effective electroweak Lagrangians describing non–Yang–Mills self-interactions of massive vector bosons have been studied in order to parametrize possible deviations of the electroweak interaction from the SM (e.g. [1]). These are also gauge noninvariant, because the mass terms *and the nonstandard interaction terms* violate gauge invariance. However, repeating the reasoning of the previous two sections, one can easily see, that *each* effective Lagrangian with arbitrary vector-boson self-interactions (which is only invariant under $\mathrm{U}(1)_{\mathrm{em}}$ transformations) can be rewritten as an SBGT with nonlinearly realized symmetry by applying the Stueckelberg transformation (2.48). The original effective Lagrangian is the U-gauge Lagrangian of this SBGT. Again, the behaviour of the gauge noninvariant terms under gauge transformations is compensated by the addition of appropriate couplings to unphysical scalars but, in contrary to the case of a simple massive Yang–Mills theory, not only the mass terms but also the nonstandard interaction terms give rise to new nonpolynomial couplings. The resulting model is a generalized gauged nonlinear σ-model (also called chiral Lagrangian) with additional nonstandard (but gauge invariant) effective interaction terms. Because of the gauge freedom, one can do loop calculations within such a (nonrenormalizable) model in the R_ξ-gauge and thus has better opportunities to subdue the divergences. Furthermore one can avoid the ambiguities [30, 37] in calculations on the basis of the original effective Lagrangian. This result has already been obtained in [22][9], however without identifying the corresponding transformations as Stueckelberg transformtions.

A method of deriving nonstandard self-couplings of electroweak vector bosons from a gauge invariant Lagrangian with *linearly* realized symmetry (Higgs model) is to add to the the SM Lagrangian extra $\mathrm{SU}(2) \times \mathrm{U}(1)$ invariant interaction terms, which contain the nonstandard couplings [3]. Although there are no nonpolynomial interactions, these models are nonrenormalizable, too, because the additional interaction terms have a (mass) dimension higher than four (while in the renormalizable SM all terms have dimension four). However, it has recently been shown that, within models with extra dimension-six terms, one-loop diagrams depend (after renormalization) only logarithmically on the cut-off due to the linearly realized gauge invariance [49, 50]. In fact, most of the additional terms contain extra interactions of the Higgs boson to the gauge bosons and the Higgs boson contribution cancels the quadratic loop divergences [50]. Thus the models discussed above, which are obtained by applying a Stueckelberg transformation to an effective Lagrangian and therefore contain no physical Higgs field, will yield more severely divergent loop corrections.

It should be noted that the two applied methods to obtain nonstandard interactions from a gauge invariant model are in principle different. In [3] terms are added to the SM Lagrangian, most of them contain not only vector-boson self-interaction terms but also couplings to the physical Higgs boson. Thus the original effective Lagrangian is *extended* to a gauge invariant model which is not equivalent to it, since there are additional Higgs couplings. In contrary, the generalized Stueckelberg formalism, i.e. the introduction of nonlinearly realized symmetry enables one to express an effective Lagrangian in terms of an *equivalent*[10] gauge theory. On the other hand, from the above discussion it is clear how these two methods are connected. Given an effective electroweak theory with arbitrary vector-boson self-interactions, one first makes the Stueckelberg transformation (2.48) and finds the equivalent generalized gauged nonlinear σ-model. This can, like the usual gauged nonlinear σ-model, be understood as the limit $M_H \to \infty$ of a Higgs model with linearly realized symmetry [41]. To recover this Higgs model one has to substitute[11], reversing (2.60),

---

[9] For a more general and formal treatment of the relations between gauge noninvariant Lagrangians and SBGTs see [48].

[10] The proof that Lagrangians which are related to each other by a Stueckelberg transformation are physically equivalent will be given in the sections 4.2 and 5.3.2.

$$U \to \frac{\sqrt{2}}{v}\Phi \tag{2.61}$$

(with (2.3), (2.11)) and to add the Higgs self-interaction potential (2.59), which implies a nonvanishing VEV of Φ (and replaces the constraint (2.57) in the gauged nonlinear σ-model). As in section 2.5 the addition of a physical Higgs boson enables a linear parametrization of the scalar sector and removes the nonpolynomial interactions. Applying this simple formalism one can embed *each* effective electroweak theory with arbitrary vector-boson self-interactions in an SU(2)×U(1) gauge invariant theory with linearly realized symmetry which is expected to yield a more decent loop behaviour. The SBGT which contains the most general trilinear vector-boson self-interactions within a gauge invariant framework is given in [51], however, it has not explicitly been constructed there by applying this procedure. Here, I have given the general formalism to understand and to carry out this extension of an effective Lagrangian to a linear Higgs model for all types of vector-boson self-interactions[12].

---

[11] It should be clear that (2.61) cannot be understood as a field-enlarging transformation like (2.48), since the matrix Φ (2.3) cannot be expressed as a unitary matrix U (2.46). This shows that the step from the generalized gauged nonlinear σ-model to the generalized Higgs model is indeed an *extension* of the theory.

[12] The investigation of this section concerning arbitrary vector-boson self-interactions can also be applied to obtain arbitrary fermionic interactions from a (linearly or nonlinearly realized) SBGT. However, I do not stress this point here because this is of less phenomenological interest since the SM fermionic interactions are very well confirmed in experiments now.

Chapter 3

Constrained Hamiltonian Systems

It is well known that quantization (both canonical quantization and path integral quantization) has to be based on the *Hamiltonian* formalism (and not on the Lagrangian formalism) [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14] because the Hamiltonian is the generator of the time evolution of a physical system [52]. Besides, when deriving the path integral formalism from the canonical formalism one finds a Hamiltonian path integral [8].

Thus, to justify the use of the convenient Lagrangian PI (1.1) with (1.2), one has to derive it within the Hamiltonian PI formalism. This will be the subject of the following chapters. This chapter contains a review of Hamiltonian dynamics and PI quantization, on which the subsequent investigations will be based.

For the physically most interesting field theories, namely those which contain vector or fermion fields, the Hamiltonian formalism becomes more involved than for simple mechanical systems because these theories are singular, i.e. they are subject to *constraints*. Constraints are well known from classical mechanics [52]; there they usually are realized by wires or surfaces which restrict the motion of the particles. In the most important cases these external circumstances result in holonomic constraints, i.e. in constraints of the type

$$\phi_a(q_i) = 0. \tag{3.1}$$

In the usual mechanical formalism, one uses these relations in order to reduce the number of coordinates to the number of physical degrees of freedom; then the remaining coordinates are independent of each other and in the subsequent Lagrangian and Hamiltonian procedure one does not have to care for the constraints anymore [52]. In field theory[1] the concept of constraints becomes more abstract, because there the constraints are not induced by wires and surfaces. Instead, one often introduces unphysical degrees of freedom in order to obtain a manifestly Lorentz or gauge invariant formulation of a theory [8]. For example, a spinor (fermion) field contains eight real components at each space-time point, although it has only four physical degrees of freedom; a real vector field has four components but only two (in the massless case) or three (in the massive case) physical degrees of freedom; furthermore SBGTs contain unphysical scalar fields. In fact, the presence of these unphysical degrees of freedom leads to constraints; in most cases, however, these are not holonomic constraints of the type (3.1), but they have the more general form

---

[1] In fact, the formalism explained in this chapter can be developed within a mechanical framework; however its physically most important applications are in field theory.

$$\phi_a(q_i, p_i) = 0. \tag{3.2}$$

This form of the constraints, which also involves the momenta, strongly suggests a Hamiltonian treatment. Besides, even in this case it is possible to eliminate the constraints by reducing the number of variables to the number of physical degrees of freedom (as it is usually done when dealing with holonomic constraints (3.1)), however in general such a procedure is not desired because it would make it more difficult to find a manifestly Lorentz or gauge invariant formulation of the theory. Instead, one considers the constraints within the Hamiltonian formalism instead of eliminating them from the beginning.

Another feature not known from classical mechanics arises: in some cases (but not in all) constraints are connected with a gauge freedom. For example, a massive vector field involves constraints, but it has no gauge freedom (except if it is embedded in an SBGT), while a massless vector field implies constraints and a gauge freedom. Actually, these different features are also reflected within the Hamiltonian formalism because there are two types of constraints, namely: first-class constraints, which are connected with a gauge freedom, and second-class constraints, which are not. Actually, the first-class constraints are the generators of the gauge transformations. The gauge freedom can be removed from a first-class constrained system by introducing gauge-fixing conditions; constraints and g.f. conditons together form a set of second-class constraints and the resulting second-class constrained system is physically equivalent to the original first-class constrained system.

Another classification stems from the distinction between primary, secondary, etc. constraints. It refers to the stage of the formalism at which these constraints appear. The requirement that the primary constraints have to be consistent with the EOM yields the secondary constraints, and so on.

The Hamiltonian PI for a constrained system can easily be derived because one can find a canonical transformation, such that one part of the resulting pairs of canonical variables are completely unconstrained, while the remaining ones are completely fixed by the constraints and the g.f. conditions. The Hamiltonian PI is then essentially given by the PI for the unconstrained system corresponding to the free variables. Then, by doing the above canonical transformation inversly, one finds the general expression for the Hamiltonian PI.

In this chapter I will first explain the classical dynamics and then the PI quantization of constrained Hamiltonian systems. I will restrict myself to the case of a finite number of degrees of freedom; the generaliztion to field theory works as usual. This chapter is a pure review; the reader who is interested in more details is referred to the original literature [9, 11, 14] or to textbooks on this subject[2] [12, 13]. The basic concepts of the Hamiltonian formalism can be found in textbooks on classical mechanics (e.g. [52]).

---

[2] In particular, I will omit all involved proofs here because they can be found in the literature.

3.1 Dynamics of Constrained Systems

Consider a physical system given by the Lagrangian L which is a function of the coordinates q_i ($i = 1, \ldots, I$) and their first time derivatives. (Lagrangians with higher time derivatives will be considered in section 5.1.) This Lagrangian is *singular* if

$$\det\left(\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \dot{q}_i \partial \dot{q}_j}\right) = 0. \tag{3.3}$$

In this case not all of the equations that define the momenta p_i,

$$p_i = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}_i}, \tag{3.4}$$

can be solved for the velocities $\dot{q}_i$. Instead, some of these relations yield the *primary constraints*

$$\phi_a^{(1)}(q_i, p_i) = 0. \tag{3.5}$$

Now one can construct the Hamiltonian[3]

$$H = \dot{q}_i p_i - L \tag{3.6}$$

where the $\dot{q}_i$ have to be expressed in terms of the q_i and p_i by applying (3.4). Although (3.4) cannot be solved for all $\dot{q}_i$, one can easily show that, due to the presence of the constraints (3.5), nevertheless all the $\dot{q}_i$ can be eliminated from H, i.e. H only depends on q_i and p_i. (See the analogous argument for Lagrangians with higher derivatives in section 5.1.)

As in the unconstrained case, the Hamiltonian equations of motion follow from Hamilton's priciple

$$\delta \int [\dot{q}_i p_i - H]\, dt = 0, \tag{3.7}$$

however in this case, the variations δq_i and δp_i are not independent of each other but they are restricted by the constraints (3.5). This yields the EOM

$$\dot{f} = \{f, H^{(1)}\}\Big|_{\phi_a^{(1)}=0}, \tag{3.8}$$

(f stands for q_i, p_i or any other function of these variables) with

$$H^{(1)} \equiv H + \lambda_a \phi_a^{(1)}, \tag{3.9}$$

where the λ_a are (a priori undetermined) Lagrange multipliers.

The primary constraints have to be consistent with the EOM, i.e., the time derivative of (3.5) also has to vanish:

$$\dot{\phi}_a^{(1)} = \{\phi_a^{(1)}, H^{(1)}\}\Big|_{\phi_a^{(1)}=0} = \{\phi_a^{(1)}, H\}\Big|_{\phi_a^{(1)}=0} + \lambda_b \{\phi_a^{(1)}, \phi_b^{(1)}\}\Big|_{\phi_a^{(1)}=0} = 0. \tag{3.10}$$

For a (physically meaningful) theory, the equations (3.10) can take three possible forms, viz.

---

[3] Note that H is not unique because any expression proportional the constraints can be added to H.

- They are fulfilled automatically;
- They serve to determine the Lagrange multipliers λ_a;
- They can be written in the form

$$\phi_a^{(2)}(q_i, p_i) = 0. \tag{3.11}$$

  In this case, the constraints (3.11) also have to be satisfied in order to ensure consistency with the EOM. They are called *secondary constraints*.

This procedure has to be iterated, i.e., the demand that the time derivatives of the secondary constraints have to vanish may imply tertiary constraints, and so on, until one finally obtains a set of constraints which is consistent with the EOM. Although the various constraints are obtained at different stages of the procedure, there is no principle difference between them; actually they can be treated on the same level. It has been shown in [13] that one obtains an equivalent physical formulation of a constrained theory if one rewrites (3.8) and (3.9) as

$$\dot{f} = \{f, H_T\}\Big|_{\phi_a=0}, \tag{3.12}$$

with the total Hamiltonian

$$H_T \equiv H + \lambda_a \phi_a, \tag{3.13}$$

where ϕ_a denotes *all* constraints.

Next one wants to determine the Lagrange multipliers in (3.13). Actually, if the matrix

$$\{\phi_a, \phi_b\}\Big|_{\phi_a=0} \tag{3.14}$$

in nonsingular, the constraints are called *second-class*; in this case the relations (analogous to (3.10))

$$\dot{\phi}_a = \{\phi_a, H_T\}\Big|_{\phi_a=0} = \{\phi_a, H\}\Big|_{\phi_a=0} + \lambda_b\{\phi_a, \phi_b\}\Big|_{\phi_a=0} = 0. \tag{3.15}$$

can be solved for the λ_a:

$$\lambda_a = -\{\phi_a, \phi_b\}^{-1}\{\phi_b, H\}\Big|_{\phi_a=0}. \tag{3.16}$$

Inserting this into (3.12) with (3.13), the EOM can be written in the simple form

$$\dot{f} = \{f, H\}_{DB}, \tag{3.17}$$

where the *Dirac bracket* [14] $\{\,,\}_{DB}$ is defined as

$$\{f, g\}_{DB} \equiv \{f, g\}\Big|_{\phi_a=0} - \{f, \phi_a\}\{\phi_a, \phi_b\}^{-1}\{\phi_b, g\}\Big|_{\phi_a=0}. \tag{3.18}$$

By replacing the Poisson brackets by Dirac brackets the dynamics of a second-class constrained system can now be formulated analogously to the dynamics of an unconstrained system.

A different situation arises if the matrix (3.14) is singular. Assuming that (3.14) has the rank R, one orders the constraints such that the upper left $R \times R$ submatrix of (3.14) has a nonvanishing determinant. Then only the first R constraints are second-class and the remaining ones are *first-class*. The Lagrange multipliers corresponding to the first-class constraints cannot be determined from (3.15)[4]. Thus the equations of motion (3.12) with (3.13) contain undetermined Lagrange multipliers and therefore their solution (for given initial conditions) is not unique. (3.12) with (3.13) imply that two solutions f and f' of the EOM with the same initial condition at $t = 0$ (but with distinct choices of the Lagrange multipliers corresponding to the first-class constraints) differ after an infinitesimal time interval dt by

$$\Delta f(dt) = dt(\lambda_a - \lambda'_a)\{f, \phi^a_{1st}\} \tag{3.19}$$

(where ϕ^a_{1st} denotes only the first-class constraints). A transformation of the canonical variables, which relates different solutions of the EOM is called a *gauge transformation*. Equation (3.19) implies that the first-class constraints are the generators of (infinitesimal) gauge transformations[5]. Thus, a first-class constrained theory has a gauge freedom; it is called *degenerate*. All solutions of the EOM with the same initial conditions describe the same physical process; in other words, all points in the phase space, which are related by gauge transformations describe the same physical state of the system.

Given a degenerate theory, one can find a physically equivalent nondegenerate theory. In that theory, the unique solution of the EOM for given initial conditions turns out to be one of the various solutions of the EOM in the degenerate theory. The corresponding nondegenerate theory is constructed by imposing a *gauge* on the original theory, i.e. by introducing additional *gauge-fixing conditions*

$$\chi_a(q_i, p_i) = 0 \tag{3.20}$$

such that the number of g.f. conditions is equal to the number of first-class constraints and that the g.f. condtions and the constraints together form a set of second-class constraints which is consistent with the EOM[6]. In fact, the relations analogous to (3.15) with ϕ_a replaced by χ_a determine the Lagrange multipliers corresponding to the first-class constraints and the ambiguity in the solution of the EOM is removed; thus the gauged first-class constrained system is a physically equivalent second-class constrained system. A convenient way to construct g.f. conditions is given in [13]: One starts with primary g.f. conditions $\chi^{(1)}_a$ and constructs secondary g.f. conditions $\chi^{(2)}_a$ by demanding

$$\{\chi^{(1)}_a, H\} = 0 \tag{3.21}$$

which ensures the consistency with the EOM. Finally, if one considers a gauged first-class constrained system, H_T (3.13) in the EOM (3.12) can be replaced by

$$H_T \equiv H + \lambda_a\phi_a + \tilde{\lambda}_a\chi_a. \tag{3.22}$$

---

[4] In fact, they cannot be determined from the complete EOM, (3.12) with (3.13), either [13].

[5] In distinction from Dirac's original statement, not only the primary first-class constraints but all first-class constraints generate gauge transformations because $H^{(1)}$ (3.9) in the EOM can be replaced by H_T (3.13) [13].

[6] Faddeev also required that $\{\chi_a, \chi_b\} = 0$ [9]. This condition is unnecessary [12, 13, 53]. Actually, later in this thesis I will use g.f. conditions that do not satisfy this relation.

From (3.22) it is obvious that the constraints and the g.f. conditions can be applied in order to convert the Hamiltonian and each other because this corresponds to a redefinition of the Lagrange multipliers.

The standard examples of a first- and a second-class constrained system are the massless and the massive vector field, which will be discussed later in this thesis (within the treatment of effective Lagrangians). It turns out that a massive vector field is subject to two second-class constraints. This means that among the four field components and the four conjugate fields there are only six independent degrees of freedom (three fields and three generalized momenta). In the Hamiltonian treatment of a massless vector field, two first-class constraints arise and therefore two gauge-fixing conditions have to be introduced. Thus there are only two physical field components and two physical momenta. Besides, the first-class constraints are related to the gauge freedom of a massless vector field.

All the features discussed above become very obvious if one applies a theorem derived in [13, 54], which states that one can find canonical variables (written in pairs as $(\bar{q}_i, \bar{p}_i)$, (Q_i, P_i), $(\mathcal{Q}_i, \mathcal{P}_i)$) for an arbitrary constrained system such that the second-class constraints are

$$Q_i = 0, \qquad P_i = 0 \tag{3.23}$$

and the first-class constraints are

$$\mathcal{P}_i = 0. \tag{3.24}$$

It should be noted that the single constraints ϕ_a do not correspond to the Q_i, P_i and $\mathcal{P}_i$ (because, in general, the Poisson brackets among them are not canonical ones) but all the constraints ϕ_a together can be expressed as (3.23) and (3.24). With this choice of canonical variables the fundamental Poisson brackets immediately imply that the Lagrange multipliers corresponding to the second-class constraints (3.23) can be determined from (3.15) and that those corresponding to the first-class constraints are undetermined. Thus the solutions of the EOM (3.12) with (3.13) for the $\bar{q}_i$ and $\bar{p}_i$ are unique, while the $\mathcal{Q}_i$ are completely arbitrary. The gauge transformations are shifts of the $\mathcal{Q}_i$ which are generated by the first-class constraints $\mathcal{P}_i$, while the second-class constraints do not give rise to gauge freedom. In order to construct a gauge of this theory, one has to fix the $\mathcal{Q}_i$, i.e., one has to impose g.f. conditions

$$\mathcal{Q}_i - f_i = 0, \tag{3.25}$$

where the f_i are functions of the remaining variables. Equations (3.23), (3.24) and (3.25) imply that the physical sector of this constrained theory is parametrized in terms of the canonical variables $\bar{q}_i$ and $\bar{p}_i$ alone. Thus, in a reduced phase space, which consists only of these variables, one can treat this physical system as an unconstrained one. However, as mentioned above, in general one does not use this choice of unconstrained parameters because in the primordial constrained parametrization it is easier to find a manifestly Lorentz or gauge invariant formulation of the theory. Besides, it is not always possible to find the explicit form of the abovementioned canonical transformation [13].

3.2 The Hamiltonian Path Integral for Constrained Systems

Now one can quantize a constrained physical system within the Hamiltonian PI formalism[7]. To derive the Hamiltonian PI it is sufficient to consider first only second-class constrained systems. As explained at the end of the preceding section, such a system is equivalent to an unconstrained one with a reduced phase space consisting of the variables $\bar{q}_i$ and $\bar{p}_i$. The Hamiltonian PI for this unconstrained system has the well-known simple form [8]

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}\bar{q}_i \mathcal{D}\bar{p}_i \, \exp\left\{ i \int dt \left[\dot{\bar{q}}_i \bar{p}_i - H|_{Q_i=P_i=0} \right] \right\} \tag{3.26}$$

In the enlarged phase space that also contains the variables Q_i and P_i which are zero due to the second-class constraints (3.23), this can be written as

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}\bar{q}_i \mathcal{D}\bar{p}_i \mathcal{D}Q_i \mathcal{D}P_i \, \exp\left\{ i \int dt \, \left[\dot{\bar{q}}_i \bar{p}_i + \dot{Q}_i P_i - H \right] \right\} \delta(Q_i)\delta(P_i). \tag{3.27}$$

Now one can pass to the original second-class constraints ϕ_a which are independent functions of the Q_i and P_i. This affects the δ-functions in (3.27). One finds

$$\delta(Q_i)\delta(P_i) = \delta(\phi_a)\mathrm{Det}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\{\phi_a, \phi_b\}\delta(x^0 - y^0)). \tag{3.28}$$

The δ-function in the argument of the determinant is missing in [9, 11, 12, 13]. However it necessarily has to be present, because the factor $\mathrm{Det}^{\frac{1}{2}}\{\phi_a, \phi_b\}$ (where ϕ_a and ϕ_b are taken at equal times) has to be introduced for *all* times and $\mathrm{Det}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\{\phi_a, \phi_b\}\delta(x^0 - y^0))$ is the "product" of this expression over all times.

Inserting (3.28) into (3.27) one obtains an expression which is invariant under canonical transformations. Thus, one can go back from the canonical variables $(\bar{q}_i, \bar{p}_i)$, (Q_i, P_i) to the primordial ones, (q_i, p_i), and finds

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}q_i \mathcal{D}p_i \, \exp\left\{ i \int dt \, [\dot{q}_i p_i - H] \right\} \delta(\phi_a) \, \mathrm{Det}^{\frac{1}{2}} \, (\{\phi_a, \phi_b\}\delta(x^0 - y^0)). \tag{3.29}$$

This is the general form of the Hamiltonian PI for a second-class constrained system. This result can easily be extended to the case of a system with first- and second-class constraints because that becomes a second-class constrained system after the introduction of g.f. conditions. Thus, (3.29) can be applied to this case; then the ϕ_a denote the second-class constraints ϕ^a_{2nd}, the first-class constraints ϕ^a_{1st} and the g.f. conditions χ^a. One finally finds[8] [9, 11, 12, 13]:

$$\begin{aligned} Z \;\; = \;\; & \int \mathcal{D}q_i \mathcal{D}p_i \, \exp\left\{ i \int dt \, [\dot{q}_i p_i - H] \right\} \delta(\phi^a_{2nd})\delta(\phi^a_{1st})\delta(\chi^a) \\ & \times \mathrm{Det}^{\frac{1}{2}} \, (\{\phi^a_{2nd}, \phi^b_{2nd}\}\delta(x^0 - y^0)) \, \mathrm{Det} \, (\{\phi^a_{1st}, \chi^b\}\delta(x^0 - y^0)). \end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

---

[7] The derivation of the Hamiltonian PI that is briefly reviewed in this section is the one given in [13], which is different from the original derivation in [9, 11].

[8] Remember that I will add the source terms in the generating functional after all manipulations will have been done, as pointed out in the introduction.

This is the Hamiltonian path integral for an arbitrary constrained system. It has the following properties [9, 11, 12, 13]:

- It is invariant under canonical transformations;
- It is invariant with respect to the choice of an equivalent set of constraints;
- It is independent of the choice of the gauge-fixing conditions.

The investigations in the subsequent chapters will be based on this Hamiltonian path integral (strictly speaking on its field theoretical generalization).

Chapter 4

Effective Lagrangians with Massive Vector Fields

Now I come to the main point of this thesis, namely the proof of the HLE theorem, i.e. the derivation of the simple Lagrangian path integral (1.1) with (1.2) or (1.3) from the correct but more involved Hamiltonian path integral (3.30), for effective interactions of scalars, fermions, massless and massive vector bosons. This will be the subject of this and the following two chapters.

In this chapter I will restrict myself to effective (non–Yang–Mills) self interactions of massive vector fields, which is the most interesting case, first because it is phenomenologically very important with respect to the investigation of effective electroweak Lagrangians [1, 2, 3] and second because it is interesting for theoretical reasons since massive vector fields can be embedded in three types of theories (as discussed in chapter 2), namely in gauge noninvariant models [1], in gauged nonlinear σ-models [2] (i.e., SBGTs with a nonlinearly realized scalar sector) and in Higgs models [3] (i.e., SBGTs with a linearly realized scalar sector). I will first prove the HLE theorem for gauge noninvariant models and then extend it to SBGTs by applying the Stueckelberg formalism introduced in the chapter 2, which relates gauge noninvariant Lagrangians to SBGTs. To this end I will reformulate the Stueckelberg formalism within the Hamiltonian formalism as a transition from a second-class constrained theory to a first-class constrained theory, which is realized as follows: One first enlarges the phase space by introducing new (unphysical) variables; in addition one has extra constraints so that the number of physical degrees of freedom remains unchanged. Next, one uses these additional constraints in order to convert the Hamiltonian and the primordial constraints. Finally, one half of the second-class constraints are considered to be first-class constraints and the other half to be gauge-fixing conditions. This procedure implies the equivalence of Lagrangians which are related to each other by a Stueckelberg transformation.

The proof of the HLE theorem for (nonlinearly realized) SBGTs goes then as follows: Using the Stueckelberg formalism I will show that the generating functional corresponding to an SBGT can be written as a Lagrangian PI with the quantized Lagrangian being identical to the U-gauge Lagrangian of this SBGT (i.e., the Lagrangian which is obtained by removing all unphysical scalar fields from the gauge invariant one). In chapter 2 I have shown that this generating functional is the result of the FP procedure if the g.f. conditions that all unphysical scalar fields become equal to zero are imposed. Then I will use the equivalence of all gauges [20, 23] in order to generalize this result to any other gauge.

Finally, I will prove the HLE theorem for Higgs models, i.e. for SBGTs with linearly realized scalar fields. Because each Higgs model is related to a nonlinear Stueckelberg model by a simple point transformation such as (2.41) that delinearizes the scalar sector (as discussed in chapter 2), and since within the Hamiltonian formalism a point transformation becomes a canonical transformation which leaves the Hamiltonian PI invariant, the result for nonlinearly realized SBGTs can easily be extended to the case of linearly realized SBGTs. As in the nonlinear case, the HLE theorem will first be derived for the special case of the U-gauge and then be generalized to any other gauge.

As mentioned in the introduction, Hamiltonian PI quantization in general yields additional $\delta^4(0)$-terms to the quantized Lagrangian. It is known that in renormalizable theories (i.e. theories without effective interaction terms) these $\delta^4(0)$-terms cancel against quartic divergent loops [35, 36]; however, it is an open question how to interpret divergences higher than logarithmic within an effective (nonrenormalizable) field theory [55]. In order to prove the HLE theorem I will, according to [10], neglect these terms because they become zero in dimensional regularization [10, 29]. However, to give an example of such a $\delta^4(0)$-term, I will derive the quartically divergent Higgs self-interaction term in the quantized U-gauge Lagrangian of a minimal Higgs model by applying the Hamiltonian PI formalism. This term has already been obtained within the Lagrangian PI formalism in chapter 2.

Furthermore, I will expand all quantities in powers of the effective coupling constant[1] ϵ and neglect $O(\epsilon^2)$-terms because I assume $\epsilon \ll 1$. The restriction to the first order of ϵ is only a technical simplification; in their proof of the HLE theorem for effective interactions of scalar fields Bernard and Duncan considered also $O(\epsilon^2)$-terms and neglected $O(\epsilon^3)$-terms [10]. They supposed that the HLE theorem can in principle be proven in any finite order N of ϵ, but that with increasing N the proof becomes technically more and more involved. However this proof of the HLE theorem cannot be generalized to *all* orders of ϵ because then it is impossible to find a closed expression for the velocities and the Hamiltonian in terms of the momenta. Thus, this proof of the HLE theorem can only be applied if the effective interactions are treated perturbatively.

The investigations of this chapter will be restricted to the case of effective Lagrangians which do not depend on higher time derivatives of the fields and which depend on first time derivatives of the vector fields only through the non-Abelian field strength tensor. (The latter requirement ensures that the SBGTs corresponding to such effective Lagrangians also do not involve higher time derivatives.) The case of effective Lagrangians with higher derivatives will be treated in the next chapter.

For the clearness of the representation, I will only consider massive Yang–Mills fields (of course with extra non–Yang–Mills interactions) in which all vector bosons have equal masses together with the corresponding SBGTs. The results can easily be generalized to any other effective Lagrangian with massive vector fields, e.g., to electroweak models. In these cases the derivation becomes formally more complicated but the physically important features remain the same.

---

[1] A different approach to the Hamiltonian PI quantization of effective Lagrangians has recently been made in [56]. There no expansion in powers of the effective coupling constant is done, but instead an expansion in powers of the momenta.

The results of this chapter have first been published in [57].

4.1 The Hamilton–Lagrange Equivalence Theorem for Gauge Noninvariant Models

In this section I will quantize a massive (and thus gauge noninvariant) Yang–Mills theory with additional arbitrary non–Yang–Mills interactions [1] (which are proportional to a parameter ϵ with $\epsilon \ll 1$) in the Hamiltonian PI formalism in order to derive the simple Lagrangian form (1.1) with (1.2) of the generating functional. Some of the techniques used in the following derivation originate from the quantization of a massive Yang–Mills theory without effective interaction terms in [11] and some others from the quantization of effective interactions of scalar fields in [10].

The effective Lagrangian has the form

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0 + \epsilon\mathcal{L}_I = -\frac{1}{4}F_a^{\mu\nu}F^a_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}M^2 A_a^\mu A^a_\mu + \epsilon\mathcal{L}_I(A^a_\mu, F^a_{\mu\nu}) \tag{4.1}$$

($a = 1, \ldots, N$) with the field strength tensor

$$F^a_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A^a_\nu - \partial_\nu A^a_\mu - g f_{abc} A^b_\mu A^c_\nu. \tag{4.2}$$

For the non–Yang–Mills part of the interactions, denoted as $\mathcal{L}_I$, I make the following assumptions:

- $\mathcal{L}_I$ does not depend on higher time derivatives;
- $\mathcal{L}_I$ depends on first time derivatives of A^a_μ only through the non-Abelian field strength tensor[2] F^a_{i0} (4.2).

These conditions are fulfilled by the phenomenologically most important effective interactions, especially by all nonstandard P, C and CP invariant trilinear interactions of electroweak vector bosons [1]. Effective Lagrangians with higher derivatives will be treated in the next chapter.

From (4.1) one finds the momenta

$$\pi^a_0 = \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\dot{A}^0_a} = 0, \tag{4.3}$$

$$\pi^a_i = \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\dot{A}^i_a} = F^a_{i0} + \epsilon\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}_I}{\partial\dot{A}^i_a} = \dot{A}^i_a + \partial_i A^a_0 - g f_{abc} A^b_i A^c_0 + \epsilon\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}_I}{\partial\dot{A}^i_a}. \tag{4.4}$$

---

[2] Actually, this requirement is equivalent to the demand that $\mathcal{L}_I$ does not depend on $\dot{A}^a_0$.

Equation (4.4) can be solved for the $\dot{A}^i_a$ (in first order[3] of ϵ)

$$\dot{A}^i_a = \pi^a_i - \partial_i A^a_0 + g f_{abc} A^b_i A^c_0 - \epsilon \left.\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_I}{\partial \dot{A}^i_a}\right|_{F^a_{i0} \to \pi^a_i} + O(\epsilon^2). \tag{4.5}$$

The Hamiltonian is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} &= \pi^a_\mu \dot{A}^\mu_a - \mathcal{L} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\pi^a_i \pi^a_i - \pi^a_i \partial_i A^a_0 + g f_{abc} \pi^a_i A^b_i A^c_0 + \frac{1}{4} F^a_{ij} F^a_{ij} - \frac{1}{2} M^2 (A^a_0 A^a_0 - A^a_i A^a_i) \\ &\quad - \epsilon \bar{\mathcal{L}}_I + O(\epsilon^2), \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_I$ is given by

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}_I \equiv \mathcal{L}_I |_{F^a_{i0} \to \pi^a_i}. \tag{4.7}$$

Equation (4.3) yields the primary constraints

$$\phi^a_1 = \pi^a_0 = 0. \tag{4.8}$$

As discussed in section 3.1, the requirement (3.10) that the primary constraints have to be consistent with the equations of motion, in general, implies secondary constraints. In this case one finds

$$\phi^a_2 = \partial_i \pi^a_i + g f_{abc} \pi^b_i A^c_i - M^2 A^a_0 - \epsilon \frac{\partial \bar{\mathcal{L}}_I}{\partial A^a_0} + O(\epsilon^2) = 0. \tag{4.9}$$

There are no further constraints. The Poisson brackets of the primary and the secondary constraints (which are taken at equal times) are

$$\{\phi^a_1(\mathbf{x}), \phi^b_2(\mathbf{y})\} = \left(M^2 \delta^{ab} + \epsilon \frac{\partial^2 \bar{\mathcal{L}}_I}{\partial A^a_0 \partial A^b_0} + O(\epsilon^2) \right) \delta^3(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}). \tag{4.10}$$

Since $\{\phi^a_1(\mathbf{x}), \phi^b_1(\mathbf{y})\} = 0$, one obtains

$$\text{Det}^{\frac{1}{2}} \{\phi^a, \phi^b\} = (-1)^{N+1} \text{Det} \{\phi^a_1, \phi^b_2\} \neq 0 \tag{4.11}$$

(where the $\phi^a = (\phi^a_1, \phi^a_2)$ denote all constraints). Thus, the constraints are second-class. This is due to the fact that $\mathcal{L}$ is gauge noninvariant, since the mass term and (in general) the non–Yang–Mills interactions in $\mathcal{L}_I$ break gauge invariance explicitly.

The generating functional for a second-class constrained system is generally given by (3.29) [11, 12, 13]. In this case it has the form[4]

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int \mathcal{D}A^a_\mu \mathcal{D}\pi^a_\mu \exp\left\{ i \int d^4x \, [\pi^a_\mu \dot{A}^\mu_a - \mathcal{H}] \right\} \\ &\qquad \times \delta(\phi^a_1) \delta(\phi^a_2) \, \text{Det}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\{\phi^a(\mathbf{x}), \phi^b(\mathbf{y})\} \delta(x^0 - y^0)). \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

---

[3] Remember that without neglecting higher powers of ϵ it would, in general, be impossible to find closed expressions for the $\dot{A}^a_i$ in terms of the A^a_μ and π^a_i from (4.4); however the restriction to the first order of ϵ is a purely technical simplification.

[4] It is obvious that in (4.12) one has to take the product of the integration measure and of the δ-functions over all Lorentz and gauge-group indices and that the constraints in the Poisson brackets have to be taken at equal times, although this is not explicitly written down there. I will use this simplified notation throughout this thesis.

The determinant in (4.12) only yields a $\delta^4(0)$-term which is neglected here. This can be seen as follows: With $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_I^Q$ being the part of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_I$ which is quadratic in the fields, and $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_I^{NQ}$ being the part, which contains the cubic, quartic, etc. terms, equations (4.10) and (4.11) imply that the determinant has the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Det}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\{\phi^a(\mathbf{x}),\phi^b(\mathbf{y})\}\delta(x^0-y^0)) &= \mathrm{Det}\left[\left(M^2\delta^{ab}+\epsilon\frac{\partial^2\bar{\mathcal{L}}_I^{NQ}}{\partial A_0^a\partial A_0^b}+O(\epsilon^2)\right)\delta^4(x-y)\right] \\ &\quad\times\mathrm{Det}\left[\left(\delta^{ab}+\epsilon\frac{1}{M^2}\frac{\partial^2\bar{\mathcal{L}}_I^{Q}}{\partial A_0^a\partial A_0^b}\right)\delta^4(x-y)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

Due to the definition of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_I^Q$, the second of these determinants is constant and can thus be neglected. The first one can be rewritten as a functional integral over Grassmann variables (in analogy to (2.16)) which yields a ghost term

$$\mathcal{L}_{ghost}=-M^2\eta_a^*\eta_a-\epsilon\eta_a^*\frac{\partial^2\bar{\mathcal{L}}_I^{NQ}}{\partial A_0^a\partial A_0^b}\eta_b+O(\epsilon^2). \tag{4.14}$$

The ghost fields are static, i.e. (4.14) contains no kinetic terms for them, only mass terms and couplings to the A_a^μ-fields. This means, all ghost propagators are simply inverse masses and thus all ghost loops are (at least) quartically divergent. Therefore, the ghost term can be replaced by a $\delta^4(0)$-term which yields the same contribution to S-matrix elements as the ghost loops. (See the similar reasoning in section 2.2.)

Dropping the determinant, integrating out the π_0^a and using the relation

$$\delta(\phi_2^a)\propto\int\mathcal{D}\lambda^a\,\exp\left\{-i\int d^4x\,\lambda^a\phi_2^a\right\} \tag{4.15}$$

one finds

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int\mathcal{D}A_\mu^a\mathcal{D}\pi_i^a\mathcal{D}\lambda^a\,\exp\left\{i\int d^4x\left[-\frac{1}{2}\pi_i^a\pi_i^a\right.\right. \\ &\quad+\pi_i^a(\dot{A}_a^i+\partial_i(A_0^a+\lambda^a)-gf_{abc}A_i^b(A_0^c+\lambda^c))-\frac{1}{4}F_{ij}^aF_{ij}^a \\ &\quad+\frac{1}{2}M^2((A_0^a+\lambda^a)(A_0^a+\lambda^a)-\lambda^a\lambda^a-A_i^aA_i^a) \\ &\quad\left.\left.+\epsilon\left(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_I+\lambda^a\frac{\partial\bar{\mathcal{L}}_I}{\partial A_0^a}\right)+O(\epsilon^2)\right]\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

The substitution

$$A_0^a\to A_0^a-\lambda^a, \tag{4.17}$$

which obviously leaves the functional integration measure invariant, yields (after neglecting $O(\epsilon^2)$-terms)

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int\mathcal{D}A_\mu^a\mathcal{D}\pi_i^a\mathcal{D}\lambda^a\,\exp\left\{i\int d^4x\left[-\frac{1}{2}\pi_i^a\pi_i^a+\pi_i^aF_{i0}^a-\frac{1}{4}F_{ij}^aF_{ij}^a\right.\right. \\ &\quad\left.\left.+\frac{1}{2}M^2(A_0^aA_0^a-\lambda^a\lambda^a-A_i^aA_i^a)-\epsilon\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_I(A_\mu^a,\partial_iA_\mu^a,\pi_i^a,\lambda^a)\right]\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

with

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_I(A^a_\mu, \partial_i A^a_\mu, \pi^a_i, \lambda^a) \equiv -\left(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_I + \lambda^a \frac{\partial \bar{\mathcal{L}}_I}{\partial A^a_0}\right)\Bigg|_{A^a_0 \to A^a_0 - \lambda^a}. \tag{4.19}$$

Now one can generalize the proof of the HLE theorem for effective interactions of scalar fields [10] to the present case. Introducing sources K^a_i and K^a_λ coupled to π^a_i and λ^a, one can rewrite (4.18) in a form in which π^a_i and λ^a occur at most quadratically:

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int \mathcal{D}A^a_\mu \exp\left\{-i\int d^4x\, \epsilon \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_I\left(A^a_\mu, \partial_i A^a_\mu, \frac{\delta}{i\delta K^a_i}, \frac{\delta}{i\delta K^a_\lambda}\right)\right\} \\ &\quad \times \int \mathcal{D}\pi^a_i \mathcal{D}\lambda^a \exp\left\{i\int d^4x \left[-\frac{1}{2}\pi^a_i\pi^a_i + \pi^a_i F^a_{i0} - \frac{1}{4}F^a_{ij}F^a_{ij}\right.\right. \\ &\quad \left.\left. + \frac{1}{2}M^2(A^a_0 A^a_0 - \lambda^a\lambda^a - A^a_i A^a_i) + \pi^a_i K^a_i + \lambda^a K^a_\lambda\right)\right]\Bigg\}\Bigg|_{K^a_i = K^a_\lambda = 0}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

Now one can carry out the Gaussian integrations over π^a_i and λ^a and finds

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int \mathcal{D}A^a_\mu \exp\left\{i\int d^4x\, \mathcal{L}_0\right\} \\ &\quad \times \exp\left\{-i\int d^4x\, \epsilon\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_I\left(A^a_\mu, \partial_i A^a_\mu, \frac{\delta}{i\delta K^a_i}, \frac{\delta}{i\delta K^a_\lambda}\right)\right\} \\ &\quad \times \exp\left\{i\int d^4x \left[\frac{1}{2}K^a_i K^a_i + \frac{1}{2}K^a_\lambda K^a_\lambda + K^a_i F^a_{i0}\right]\right\}\Bigg|_{K^a_i = K^a_\lambda = 0} \end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_0$ is the massive Yang–Mills part of the effective Lagrangian (4.1). The use of the functional identity [58]

$$F\left[\frac{\delta}{i\delta K}\right] G[K]\Bigg|_{K=0} = G\left[\frac{\delta}{i\delta\rho}\right] F[\rho]\Bigg|_{\rho=0} \tag{4.22}$$

yields

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int \mathcal{D}A^a_\mu \exp\left\{i\int d^4x\, \mathcal{L}_0\right\} \\ &\quad \times \exp\left\{\int d^4x \left[-\frac{i}{2}\sum_{i,a}\left(\frac{\delta}{\delta\rho^a_i}\right)^2 - \frac{i}{2}\sum_a\left(\frac{\delta}{\delta\rho^a_\lambda}\right)^2 + F^a_{i0}\left(\frac{\delta}{\delta\rho^a_i}\right)\right]\right\} \\ &\quad \times \exp\left\{-i\int d^4x\, \epsilon\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_I\left(A^a_\mu, \partial_i A^a_\mu, \rho^a_i, \rho^a_\lambda\right)\right\}\Bigg|_{\rho^a_i = \rho^a_\lambda = 0}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

The third exponential in (4.23) can be expanded in powers of ϵ:

$$\exp\left\{-i\int d^4x\, \epsilon\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_I\left(A^a_\mu, \partial_i A^a_\mu, \rho^a_i, \rho^a_\lambda\right)\right\} = 1 - i\int d^4x\, \epsilon\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_I\left(A^a_\mu, \partial_i A^a_\mu, \rho^a_i, \rho^a_\lambda\right) + O(\epsilon^2). \tag{4.24}$$

Obviously, second functional derivatives with respect to the ρ's acting on this expression yield terms which are proportional to ϵ^2 or to $\delta^4(0)$ and thus neglected here. Therefore, the second and the third exponential in (4.23) together reduce to

$$\exp\left\{\int d^4x\, F^a_{i0}\left(\frac{\delta}{\delta\rho^a_i}\right)\right\}\exp\left\{-i\int d^4x\,\epsilon\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_I\left(A^a_\mu,\partial_i A^a_\mu,\rho^a_i,\rho^a_\lambda\right)\right\}\Bigg|_{\rho^a_i=\rho^a_\lambda=0}$$
$$=\exp\left\{-i\int d^4x\,\epsilon\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_I\left(A^a_\mu,\partial_i A^a_\mu,\rho^a_i,\rho^a_\lambda\right)\right\}\Bigg|_{\substack{\rho^a_i=F^a_{i0}\\ \rho^a_\lambda=0}}. \qquad (4.25)$$

With the definitions of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_I$ (4.19) and of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_I$ (4.7) one finds

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_I\left(A^a_\mu,\partial_i A^a_\mu,\rho^a_i,\rho^a_\lambda\right)\Bigg|_{\substack{\rho^a_i=F^a_{i0}\\ \rho^a_\lambda=0}} = -\mathcal{L}_I(A^\mu_a,F^{\mu\nu}_a). \qquad (4.26)$$

Inserting (4.25) with (4.26) into (4.23) and introducing source terms one finally obtains (apart from $O(\epsilon^2)$- and $\delta^4(0)$-terms)

$$Z[J]=\int\mathcal{D}A^a_\mu\,\exp\left\{i\int d^4x\left[\mathcal{L}_0+\epsilon\mathcal{L}_I+J^a_\mu A^\mu_a\right]\right\}, \qquad (4.27)$$

which is the expected result, namely the simple Lagrangian path integral (1.1) with (1.2). Thus, the HLE theorem is proven for effective self interactions of massive vector fields (within gauge noninvariant models).

This proof can easily be extended to Lagrangians which also contain effective interactions of massive vector fields with other fields (scalar, fermion or additional vector fields). In order to derive this result, one adds the kinetic and the mass terms of the extra fields as well as their standard interactions to $\mathcal{L}_0$ in (4.1) and the nonstandard couplings to $\mathcal{L}_I$ and then goes through the same procedure as above (see, for comparison, the treatment of effective gauge theories in section 6.1). Thus, the HLE theorem also holds for effective vector–fermion and vector–scalar interactions. An application of this result, which will become important in section 4.3, is to consider $\mathcal{L}_0$ as the U-gauge Lagrangian of a (minimal) Higgs model, while $\mathcal{L}_I$ contains additional effective interactions of the vector and Higgs fields.

4.2 The Stueckelberg Formalism

In this section I will prove the HLE theorem for SBGTs with nonlinearly realized symmetry which contain arbitrary gauge-boson self-interactions within a gauge invariant framework [2]. It has been shown in [22] and in section 2.7 that each theory given by an effective Lagrangian of the type (4.1) can be rewritten as a (nonlinearly realized) SBGT by applying a Stueckelberg transformation [18, 19]. On the other hand, each nonlinear SBGT can be obtained by applying a Stueckelberg transformation to a gauge noninvariant Lagrangian such as (4.1). Thus, I will reformulate the Stueckelberg formalism within the Hamiltonian formalism in order to prove that effective Lagrangians which are related to each other by a Stueckelberg transformation are equivalent (at the classical and at the quantum level).

As in chapter 2, I parametrize the Yang–Mills fields and the Stueckelberg fields in the matrix notation: With t_a being the generators of the gauge group, which are orthonormalized according to

$$\mathrm{tr}\,(t_a t_b) = \frac{1}{2}\delta_{ab}, \tag{4.28}$$

one defines the matrix-valued fields

$$\begin{aligned} A_\mu &\equiv A^a_\mu t_a, && (4.29)\\ \varphi &\equiv i\frac{g}{M}\varphi^a t_a, && (4.30)\\ U &\equiv \exp\varphi. && (4.31) \end{aligned}$$

The φ^a are the unphysical pseudo-Goldstone scalars.

Let me consider a massive Yang–Mills theory with non–Yang–Mills vector-boson self-interactions given by the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ (4.1). I apply the Stueckelberg transformation

$$A_\mu \to -\frac{i}{g}U^\dagger D_\mu U = U^\dagger A_\mu U - \frac{i}{g}U^\dagger \partial_\mu U = U^\dagger A_\mu U + \frac{1}{M}\partial_\mu\varphi^a U^\dagger Q_a \tag{4.32}$$

where $D_\mu U$ is the covariant derivative of U

$$D_\mu U \equiv \partial_\mu U + igA_\mu U \tag{4.33}$$

and Q_a is given by

$$Q_a \equiv \left(t_a + \frac{1}{2!}(\varphi t_a + t_a\varphi) + \frac{1}{3!}(\varphi^2 t_a + \varphi t_a \varphi + t_a\varphi^2) + \ldots\right). \tag{4.34}$$

As pointed out in chapter 2, the Stueckelberg transformation (4.32) *formally* acts like a gauge transformation, however, with the gauge parameters being replaced by the pseudo-Goldstone fields. Thus, it only changes the mass term and the effective interaction term $\mathcal{L}_I$ in (4.1) in a nontrivial way but not the gauge invariant Yang–Mills term $-\frac{1}{4}F^{\mu\nu}_a F^a_{\mu\nu}$. (4.32) can be written in components by multiplying with $2t_a$ and taking the trace. With (4.28) and (4.29) one finds

$$A^a_\mu \to X_{ab}A^b_\mu + \frac{1}{M}Y_{ab}\partial_\mu\varphi^b \tag{4.35}$$

where the matrices X_{ab} and Y_{ab} are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} X_{ab} &\equiv 2\mathrm{tr}\,(U^\dagger t_b U t_a), && (4.36)\\ Y_{ab} &\equiv 2\mathrm{tr}\,(U^\dagger Q_b t_a). && (4.37) \end{aligned}$$

X_{ab} and Y_{ab} are nonpolynomial expressions in the pseudo-Goldstone fields φ^a. They do not depend on the derivatives $\partial_\mu\varphi^a$ and, due to (4.28), they become unity matrices for vanishing φ^a:

$$X_{ab}(\varphi^a = 0) = Y_{ab}(\varphi^a = 0) = \delta_{ab}. \tag{4.38}$$

The SBGT corresponding to the effective Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ (4.1) is given by the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}^S \equiv \mathcal{L}\big|_{A_\mu \to U^\dagger A_\mu U - \frac{i}{g} U^\dagger \partial_\mu U}. \tag{4.39}$$

$\mathcal{L}$ can be recovered from $\mathcal{L}^S$ simply by removing all unphysical scalar fields

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}^S\big|_{\varphi_a = 0}. \tag{4.40}$$

$\mathcal{L}^S$ describes a generalized gauged nonlinear σ-model (or chiral Lagrangian) with extra non-Yang–Mills vector-boson self-interactions contained in the gauge invariant term $\mathcal{L}_I^S$, which is obtained by applying (4.32) to $\mathcal{L}_I$ (see section 2.7). I will show in subsection 5.3.2 (for the more general case that also higher derivatives occur in $\mathcal{L}^S$) that each nonlinearly realized effective SBGT given by a Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}^S$ can be constructed by applying the Stueckelberg transformation (4.32) to an effective Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ (4.1), which is obtained from $\mathcal{L}^S$ by removing the pseudo-Goldstone fields. In this section I prove that the Lagrangians $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}^S$ are equivalent within the Hamiltonian formalism[5] and that $\mathcal{L}$ is the U-gauge of $\mathcal{L}^S$; i.e. the U-gauge of a (nonlinear) effective SBGT can simply be constructed by dropping all unphysical scalar fields (as in the Lagrangain treatment of chapter 2). This is not obvious because the Stueckelberg transformation (4.32) involves derivatives of the pseudo-Goldstone fields and thus it is not a point transformation which corresponds to a canonical transformation within the Hamiltonian framework[6].

One can easily see that, if $\mathcal{L}$ satisfies the conditions listed at the beginning of section 4.1, $\mathcal{L}_S$ also fulfils these requirements, since the field strength tensor transforms under a Stuekkelberg transformation as

$$F_{\mu\nu} \longrightarrow U^\dagger F_{\mu\nu} U \tag{4.41}$$

(with $F_{\mu\nu} = F^a_{\mu\nu} t_a$). Written in components this becomes

$$F^a_{\mu\nu} \longrightarrow X_{ab} F^b_{\mu\nu}. \tag{4.42}$$

For the subsequent treatment it is convenient to rewrite (4.39) as

$$\mathcal{L}^S = \mathcal{L}\Bigg|_{\substack{A_\mu \to U^\dagger A_\mu U - \frac{i}{g} U^\dagger \partial_\mu U \\ F_{\mu\nu} \to U^\dagger F_{\mu\nu} U}} = \mathcal{L}\Bigg|_{\substack{A^a_0 \to X_{ab} A^b_0 + \frac{1}{M} Y_{ab} \dot{\varphi}^b \\ A^a_i \to X_{ab} A^b_i + \frac{1}{M} Y_{ab} \partial_i \varphi^b \\ F^a_{i0} \to X_{ab} F^b_{i0} \\ F^a_{ij} \to X_{ab} F^b_{ij}}}, \tag{4.43}$$

where the following convention is used: While in (4.39) the Stueckelberg transformation is applied to A_μ *everywhere* in $\mathcal{L}$ (which automatically implies the transformation of $F_{\mu\nu}$ (4.41)), in (4.43) it is applied to the A_μ-field only where this does not occur as a part of the field strength tensor $F_{\mu\nu}$, and $F_{\mu\nu}$ becomes then transformed seperately. I will use this convention throughout this section.

---

[5] For a simple gauged nonlinear σ-model *without* effective interactions this equivalence was shown in [59] (in a very formal and abstract way).

[6] Actually, within the Hamiltonian treatment of Lagrangians with higher derivatives (Ostrogradsky formalism [25]) a Stueckelberg transformation becomes a canonical transformation. This will be discussed in subsection 5.3.2. In this chapter, however, I do not use the Ostrogradsky formalism.

The momenta conjugate to the fields in $\mathcal{L}^S$ are

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi^a_0 &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}^S}{\partial \dot{A}^0_a} = 0, && (4.44)\\
\pi^a_i &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}^S}{\partial \dot{A}^i_a} = F^a_{i0} + \epsilon \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}^S_I}{\partial \dot{A}^i_a} = \dot{A}^i_a + \partial_i A^a_0 - g f_{abc} A^b_i A^c_0 + \epsilon \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}^S_I}{\partial \dot{A}^i_a}, && (4.45)\\
\pi^a_\varphi &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}^S}{\partial \dot{\varphi}^a} = M Y_{ca} \left(X_{cb} A^b_0 + \frac{1}{M} Y_{cb} \dot{\varphi}^b \right) + \epsilon \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}^S_I}{\partial \dot{\varphi}^a}. && (4.46)
\end{aligned}$$

In first order of ϵ one finds the velocities

$$\dot{A}^i_a = \pi^a_i - \partial_i A^a_0 + g f_{abc} A^b_i A^c_0 - \epsilon \left.\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}^S_I}{\partial \dot{A}^i_a}\right|_{\substack{F^a_{i0} \to \pi^a_i \\ \dot{\varphi}^a \to Y^{-1}_{ab}\left(Y^{-1}_{cb} \pi^c_\varphi - M X_{bc} A^c_0\right)}} + O(\epsilon^2), \tag{4.47}$$

$$\dot{\varphi}^a = Y^{-1}_{ab} \left(Y^{-1}_{cb} \left(\pi^c_\varphi - \epsilon \left.\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}^S_I}{\partial \dot{\varphi}^c}\right|_{\substack{F^a_{i0} \to \pi^a_i \\ \dot{\varphi}^a \to Y^{-1}_{ab}\left(Y^{-1}_{cb} \pi^c_\varphi - M X_{bc} A^c_0\right)}} \right) - M X_{bc} A^c_0 \right) + O(\epsilon^2) \tag{4.48}$$

and the Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}^S &= \pi^a_\mu \dot{A}^\mu_a + \pi^a_\varphi \dot{\varphi}^a - \mathcal{L}^S \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \pi^a_i \pi^a_i - \pi^a_i \partial_i A^a_0 + g f_{abc} \pi^a_i A^b_i A^c_0 + \frac{1}{4} F^a_{ij} F^a_{ij} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} M^2 \left(\sum_a \left(X_{ab} A^b_0 \right)^2 - \sum_a \left(X_{ab} A^b_i + \frac{1}{M} Y_{ab} \partial_i \varphi^b \right)^2 \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_a (Y^{-1}_{ba} \pi^b_\varphi - M X_{ab} A^b_0)^2 - \epsilon \bar{\mathcal{L}}^S_I + O(\epsilon^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.49}$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^S_I$ is given by

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}^S_I \equiv \mathcal{L}^S_I \Big|_{\substack{F^a_{i0} \to \pi^a_i \\ \dot{\varphi}^a \to Y^{-1}_{ab}\left(Y^{-1}_{cb} \pi^c_\varphi - M X_{bc} A^c_0\right)}} = \mathcal{L}_I \Big|_{\substack{A^a_0 \to \frac{1}{M} Y^{-1}_{ba} \pi^b_\varphi \\ A^a_i \to X_{ab} A^b_i + \frac{1}{M} Y_{ab} \partial_i \varphi^b \\ F^a_{i0} \to X_{ab} \pi^b_i \\ F^a_{ij} \to X_{ab} F^b_{ij}}} . \tag{4.50}$$

The primary constraints are

$$\phi^a_1 = \pi^a_0 = 0 \tag{4.51}$$

and the secondary constraints, obtained from (3.10), are

$$\phi^a_2 = \partial_i \pi^a_i + g f_{abc} \pi^b_i A^c_i - M X_{ba} Y^{-1}_{cb} \pi^c_\varphi + O(\epsilon^2) = 0. \tag{4.52}$$

There are no terms proportional to ϵ in (4.52) (in first order of ϵ) since, due to (4.50), $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_I^S$ does not depend on A_0^a (neither directly nor through F_{i0}^a). There are no further constraints. The constraints are first-class due to the gauge freedom of $\mathcal{L}^S$ (4.39).

As discussed in section 3.1, such a first-class constrained sytem has to be gauged in order to remove the ambiguities in the solutions of the EOM. To prove the equivalence of $\mathcal{L}$ (4.1) and $\mathcal{L}^S$ (4.39) I construct the U-gauge by imposing the primary g.f. conditions

$$\chi_1^a = \varphi^a = 0. \tag{4.53}$$

The demand (3.21) yields the secondary g.f. conditions

$$\chi_2^a = Y_{ab}^{-1}\left(Y_{cb}^{-1}\pi_\varphi^c - MX_{bc}A_0^c\right) - \epsilon\frac{\partial\bar{\mathcal{L}}_I^S}{\partial\pi_\varphi^a} + O(\epsilon^2) = 0. \tag{4.54}$$

Using the primary g.f. conditions[7] (4.53), the relation (4.38) and the defintions of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_I^S$ (4.50) and $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_I$ (4.7) one can express the Hamiltonian (4.49), the secondary constraints (4.52) and g.f. conditions (4.54) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}^S &= \frac{1}{2}\pi_i^a\pi_i^a - \pi_i^a\partial_i A_0^a + gf_{abc}\pi_i^a A_i^b A_0^c + \frac{1}{4}F_{ij}^a F_{ij}^a \\
&\quad -\frac{1}{2}M^2(A_0^aA_0^a - A_i^aA_i^a) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_a(\pi_\varphi^a - MA_0^a)^2 - \epsilon\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_I + O(\epsilon^2), && (4.55)\\
\phi_2^a &= \partial_i\pi_i^a + gf_{abc}\pi_i^b A_i^c - M\pi_\varphi^a + O(\epsilon^2) = 0, && (4.56)\\
\chi_2^a &= \pi_\varphi^a - MA_0^a - \epsilon\frac{\partial\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_I}{\partial\pi_\varphi^a} + O(\epsilon^2) = 0 && (4.57)
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_I \equiv \bar{\mathcal{L}}_I^S\Big|_{\varphi_a=0} = \bar{\mathcal{L}}_I\Big|_{A_0^a\to\frac{1}{M}\pi_\varphi^a}. \tag{4.58}$$

The ϵ-dependent term in (4.57) can be converted by applying (4.57) itself. One obtains

$$\chi_2^a = \pi_\varphi^a - MA_0^a - \epsilon\frac{1}{M}\frac{\partial\bar{\mathcal{L}}_I}{\partial A_0^a} + O(\epsilon^2) = 0. \tag{4.59}$$

Applying the secondary g.f. condition (4.59), one can rewrite the Hamiltonian (4.55) as (4.6) and the constraints (4.51), (4.56) as (4.8), (4.9) (in the first order of ϵ), i.e., as the Hamiltonian and the constraints corresponding to the gauge noninvariant Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ (4.1). Finally, the g.f. conditions (4.53) and (4.59) can be omitted, since they involve the fields φ^a and π_φ^a and neither the Hamiltonian nor the constraints depend on these fields anymore. Thus, the Lagrangians $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}^S$ in (4.39) describe equivalent physical sytems, $\mathcal{L}$ being the U-gauge of $\mathcal{L}^S$.

As the Hamiltonians and the constraints corresponding to $\mathcal{L}^S$ and to $\mathcal{L}$ are equal, the generating functional obtained when quantizing $\mathcal{L}^S$ within the Hamiltonian PI formalism is the same as the one found in the last section by quantizing $\mathcal{L}$, namely (4.27). This, however, is identical to the generating functional obtained in the (Lagrangian) Faddeev–Popov PI formalism if one imposes the g.f. conditions (4.53), as one can see in analogy to the treatment of section 2.2. Due to the equivalence of all gauges [20, 23], (4.27) yields the same S-matrix elements as the Faddeev–Popov PI corresponding to $\mathcal{L}^S$ in any other gauge (e.g. R_ξ gauge, Lorentz gauge, etc.). Thus, after the introduction of a source term, the result (1.1) with (1.3) is obtained in an arbitrary gauge.

---

[7] Remember that the constraints and the g.f. condition may be inserted into the Hamiltonian and each other as pointed out in sect. 3.1.

As mentioned in the introduction, this result cannot be *directly* derived in the R_ξ-gauge (which is the most adequate for loop calculations within an SBGT), because the corresponding g.f. conditions

$$\chi^a = \partial^\mu A^a_\mu - \xi M \varphi^a - C^a = 0 \tag{4.60}$$

are *not* g.f. conditions within the Hamiltonian formalism. This is because (4.60) cannot be written as relations among the fields and the conjugate fields alone (such as (3.20)), due to the presence of the velocities $\dot{A}^a_0$ in (4.60) that are not expressable through the momenta (remember the constraint (4.51)). Therefore, when quantizing $\mathcal{L}^S$ within the R_ξ-gauge, one has to proceed *indirectly* as described above by first constructing the U-gauge and then using the equivalence of all gauges (i.e., the invariance of the S-matrix elements under a change of the gauge in the FP formalism[8]) [20, 23] in order to rewrite this result in the R_ξ-gauge.

The above procedure demonstrates how to interpret the Stueckelberg formalism at the Hamiltonian level. While the gauge noninvariant Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ is related to the gauge invariant Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}^S$ by a Stueckelberg transformation (4.32), one can pass from the second-class constrained Hamiltonian sytem corresponding to $\mathcal{L}$ to the first-class constrained Hamiltonian system corresponding to $\mathcal{L}^S$ by the following procedure: One enlarges the phase space by introducing the unphysical variables φ^a and π^a_φ and the extra constraints (4.53) and (4.54), which make the new variables dependent on the others so that the number of physical degrees of freedom remains unchanged. Next, one applies the additional constraints (4.53) and (4.54), in order to rewrite the Hamiltonian as (4.49) and the primordial constraints as (4.51) and (4.52). Finally, half of the constraints, namely the new ones, are considered to be g.f. conditions.

A similar transition from a second- to a first-class constrained system has recently been investigated in several works [60]. However, in [60] no phase space enlargement is made with the outcome, that the resulting model contains only half as many first-class constraints as the original model has second-class constraints (the other half has become g.f. conditions.) In my treatment the number of constraints remains unchanged, since, due to the phase space enlargement, new constraints are introduced. The method of connecting first- and second-class constrained systems by a phase space enlargement was first considered in [61] (however without referring to the Stueckelberg formalism).

---

[8] Actually, loop calculations within the U-gauge suffer from ambiguities in the determination of the finite part of an S-matrix element [30, 37]; they yield the same S-matrix elements as loop calculations within the R_ξ-gauge, but only if the correct renormalization prescription is used [30]; other renormalization prescriptions yield distinct results. In the R_ξ-gauge these ambiguities are absent.

4.3 Higgs Models

Finally the HLE theorem has to be proven for SBGTs with linearly realized symmetry (Higgs models) which contain effective (non–Yang–Mills) gauge-boson self-interactions [3]. This result will simply be obtained by showing the equivalence of a linear Higgs model to a nonlinear Stueckelberg model (with (an) additional physical scalar(s)).

Unlike in the case of a gauged nonlinear σ-model discussed in the previous section it is not possible to write down the Lagrangian of a Higgs model in a general form without specifying the gauge group. Therefore I consider the case of SU(2) symmetry (i.e. $t_a = \frac{1}{2}\tau_a$, $a = 1, 2, 3$). The extension to other gauge groups is straightforward.

As shown in section 2.7, any effective Lagrangian (4.1) can be extended to a Higgs model by constructing the corresponding Stueckelberg Lagrangian (4.39) and then introducing a physical scalar field h and linearizing the scalar sector of the theory by means of the replacement

$$\frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}U \equiv \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}\exp\left(\frac{i\varphi_a\tau_a}{v}\right) \quad \rightarrow \quad \Phi \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}((v+h)\mathbf{1} + i\varphi_a\tau_a) \tag{4.61}$$

with $\frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}$ being the VEV of Φ, $v = \frac{2M}{g}$. The Lagrangian of the Higgs model corresponding to (4.1) becomes

$$\mathcal{L}^H = \mathcal{L}^S|_{\frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}U\rightarrow\Phi} - V(\Phi) \tag{4.62}$$

with the scalar self-interaction potential $V(\Phi)$ which implies the nonvanishing vacuum expectation value. Remember that, in distinction from $\mathcal{L}^S$ (4.39), $\mathcal{L}^H$ is *not* equivalent to the effective Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$, since there is an additional physical degree of freedom but that $\mathcal{L}^H$ contains the same effective vector-boson self-interactions as $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}^S$. Each effective Higgs model can be constructed this way from a Lagrangian of type (4.1).

In order to extend the results of the previous two sections to Lagrangians of the type (4.62), one uses the fact that even within a linaerly realized SBGT the scalar fields can be parametrized nonlinearly by means of the point transformation

$$\Phi \rightarrow \frac{v+h}{\sqrt{2}}U \tag{4.63}$$

with U and Φ given by (4.61) (see [20, 21, 44] and sect. 2.4). The Lagrangian of a Higgs model in which the scalar sector is nonlinearly realized,

$$\mathcal{L}^{H,S} \equiv \mathcal{L}^H|_{\Phi\rightarrow\frac{v+h}{\sqrt{2}}U}, \tag{4.64}$$

describes a Stueckelberg model with an additional physical scalar h. The equivalence between $\mathcal{L}^H$ and $\mathcal{L}^{H,S}$ can easily be established since a point transformation such as (4.63) becomes a canonical transformation within the Hamiltonian formalism, i.e. the Hamiltonians and also the constraints corresponding to $\mathcal{L}^H$ and to $\mathcal{L}^{H,S}$ are related by a canonical transformation[9].

---

[9] For the Hamiltonian and the primary constraints this statement is obvious and the secondary constraints are obtained from the Poisson brackets (3.10) which are invariant under canonical transformations.

Using the result of the previous section one finds that the U-gauge Lagrangian of $\mathcal{L}^{H,S}$ (and thus also of $\mathcal{L}^{H}$) is

$$\mathcal{L}_U^H \equiv \mathcal{L}^{H,S}|_{\varphi_a=0} = \mathcal{L}^{H}|_{\varphi_a=0}; \tag{4.65}$$

i.e., also for a linearly realized Higgs model the U-gauge is obtained simply by removing all unphysical scalar fields.

Remembering the last paragraph of section 4.1, the HLE theorem for Stueckelberg models (section 4.2) can be applied in order to quantize the nonlinear Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}^{H,S}$; the resulting generating functional has the form (1.1) with the quantized Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_{quant} = \mathcal{L}_U^H. \tag{4.66}$$

Due to the invariance of the Hamiltonian PI under canonical transformations [9, 11, 12, 13], the generating functional obtained when quantizing the linear Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}^H$ is the same. As shown in sect. 2.2, this is identical to the result of the Faddeev–Popov procedure (apart from a $\delta^4(0)$-term) if the g.f. conditions (4.53) are imposed. As in the previous section, this result can be generalized to any other gauge, which yields (1.1) with (1.3). This completes the proof of the HLE theorem for any effective Lagrangian with arbitrary interactions of massive vector fields which fulfils the requirements listed at the beginning of section 4.1.

The treatment of this section shows that the Stueckelberg formalism, which was originally introduced in order to construct Higgs-less SBGTs [18, 19, 22], also represents a powerful tool when dealing with Higgs models.

4.4 The Quartically Divergent Higgs Self-Interaction

When proving the HLE theorem in the previous sections of this chapter, I have neglected quartically divergent $\delta^4(0)$-terms. In this section I want to present a simple example of such a term. Therefore I will quantize the SU(2) Higgs model (without effective non–Yang–Mills interactions) in the U-gauge *while taking fully into account* $\delta^4(0)$*-terms* in order to derive the well-known quartically divergent Higgs self-coupling term [20, 31, 32, 34, 62, 63]. In chapter 2 this term has been derived within the Lagrangian PI formalism; in this section I will find the same term within the Hamiltonian PI formalism.

From the discussion of the previous two sections it is clear that it makes no difference whether one quantizes the gauge invariant Lagrangian of an SBGT or the corresponding U-gauge Lagrangian[10]. Thus, for simplicity, I start from the U-gauge Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}F_a^{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu}^a + \frac{1}{2}(\partial^\mu h)(\partial_\mu h) + \frac{1}{8}g^2(v+h)^2 A_a^\mu A_\mu^a - V(h, \varphi_a = 0). \tag{4.67}$$

The momenta are given by

$$\pi_0^a = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{A}_a^0} = 0, \tag{4.68}$$

---

[10] When establishing this equivalence, no $\delta^4(0)$-terms have been neglected, thus, even concerning the quartically divergent extra terms, quantization of both Lagrangians yields the same result.

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_i^a &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{A}_a^i} = F_{i0}^a = \dot{A}_a^i + \partial_i A_0^a - g f_{abc} A_i^b A_0^c, && (4.69) \\ \pi_h &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{h}} = \dot{h}, && (4.70) \end{aligned}$$

and the Hamiltonian is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} &= \pi_\mu^a \dot{A}_a^\mu + \pi_h \dot{h} - \mathcal{L} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\pi_i^a \pi_i^a + \frac{1}{2}\pi_h^2 - \pi_i^a \partial_i A_a^0 + g f_{abc} \pi_i^a A_i^b A_0^c + \frac{1}{4} F_{ij}^a F_{ij}^a + \frac{1}{2}(\partial_i h)(\partial_i h) \\ &\quad -\frac{1}{8} g^2 (v+h)^2 (A_0^a A_0^a - A_i^a A_i^a) + V(h, \varphi_a = 0). \qquad (4.71) \end{aligned}$$

The constraints turn out to be

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_1^a &= \pi_0^a = 0, && (4.72) \\ \phi_2^a &= \partial_i \pi_i^a + g f_{abc} \pi_i^b A_i^c - \frac{1}{4} g^2 (v+h)^2 A_0^a = 0. && (4.73) \end{aligned}$$

The Poisson brackets of the primary and the secondary constraints are

$$\{\phi_1^a(\mathbf{x}), \phi_2^b(\mathbf{y})\} = \frac{1}{4} g^2 (v+h)^2 \delta^{ab} \delta^3(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}). \qquad (4.74)$$

There are no further constraints. The constraints are second-class.

To quantize this model, one starts from the Hamiltonian PI (4.12), integrates out the π_0^a, uses (4.15) in order to rewrite $\delta(\phi_2^a)$, substitutes (4.17) and rewrites the deteminant using (4.11) and (4.74). The generating functional becomes

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int \mathcal{D}A_\mu^a \mathcal{D}h \mathcal{D}\pi_i^a \mathcal{D}\pi_h \mathcal{D}\lambda^a \exp\left\{ i \int d^4x \left[-\frac{1}{2}\pi_i^a \pi_i^a - \frac{1}{2}\pi_h^2 + \pi_i^a F_{i0}^a + \pi_h \dot{h} \right.\right. \\ &\quad -\frac{1}{4} F_{ij}^a F_{ij}^a - \frac{1}{2}(\partial_i h)(\partial_i h) + \frac{1}{8} g^2 (v+h)^2 (A_0^a A_0^a - \lambda^a \lambda^a - A_i^a A_i^a) \\ &\quad \left.\left. -V(h, \varphi_a = 0) + \right]\right\} \mathrm{Det}^3 \left(\frac{1}{4} g^2 (v+h)^2 \delta^4(x-y) \right). \qquad (4.75) \end{aligned}$$

Now one can carry out the Gaussian integrations over π_i^a, π_h and λ^a. Integrating out λ^a yields an extra factor $\mathrm{Det}^{-\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{4} g^2 (v+h)^2 \delta^4(x-y) \right)$. One finds

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}A_\mu^a \mathcal{D}h \exp\left\{ i \int d^4x \, \mathcal{L} \right\} \mathrm{Det} \left(\frac{1}{8} g^3 (v+h)^3 \delta^4(x-y) \right). \qquad (4.76)$$

Finally one applies (2.26) in order to rewrite the determinant as an exponential function and introduces the source terms; Z becomes then a Lagrangian PI (1.1) with the quantized U-gauge Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_{quant} = \mathcal{L} - 3i\delta^4(0) \ln \left(1 + \frac{h}{v} \right) = \mathcal{L} - 3i\delta^4(0) \ln \left(1 + \frac{g}{2M} h \right) \qquad (4.77)$$

(after dropping a constant). Thus, the quantized U-gauge Lagrangian contains, in addition to the classical Lagrangian (4.67), an extra quartically divergent Higgs self-interaction term[11] which is identical to the one obtained in chapter 2 within the Lagrangian PI formalism (2.28).

---

[11] From the proof in section 4.1 it is obvious, that the Hamiltonian PI quantization of Lagrangains with additional effective interaction terms in general yields further $\delta^4(0)$-terms. These may also contain other fields than the Higgs field.

Chapter 5

Effective Lagrangians with Higher Derivatives

In this chapter I will generalize the results obtained in the last one to effective Lagrangians which also depend on higher derivatives of the fields [24].

Actually, the proof of the HLE theorem for first-order Lagrangians can be extended to the higher-order case by applying the results of [27, 28], where it has been shown that each effective higher-order Lagrangian can be reduced to a first-order one by applying the equations of motion to the effective interaction term (upon neglecting higher powers of the effective coupling constant ϵ) since one can find field transformations which effectively result in applications of the EOM. However, the treatment of [27, 28] is incomplete because it has not been shown there that two Lagrangians which are related to each other by such field transformations are physically equivalent. In fact, this is not trivial since these transformations, in general, involve derivatives of the fields. I will show that within the Hamiltonian formalism for Lagrangians with higher derivatives (Ostrogradsky formalism [25]) even a field transformation which involves derivatives becomes a canonical transformation; this establishes the equivalence of Lagrangians that are related to each other by an arbitrary local field transformation and thus justifies the use the EOM in order to convert the effective interaction term. Since the Ostrogradsky formalism is not very well-known, I will first give a short introduction to it before deriving these results.

Making use of the abovementioned procedure of reducing effective higher-order Lagrangians to first-order ones and of the results of the last chapter, I will then prove the HLE theorem for the case of effective Lagrangians with higher derivatives[1]. I will derive this result first for the simple case of effective interactions of scalar fields and then for effective interactions of massive vector fields. In the latter case I will, as in the previous chapter, first consider gauge noninvariant models and then extend the results to SBGTs by aplying the Stueckelberg formalism. Actually, within the Ostrogradsky formalism a Stueckelberg transformation becomes a canonical transformation (see above) and thus the proof in section 4.2 that Lagrangians which are related to each other by a Stueckelberg transformation are physically equivalent can be simplified very much.

---

[1] The Lagrangian PI (1.1) with (1.2) or (1.3) has been derived for some special examples of higher-order Lagrangians in [10, 13, 64], but a general theorem has not been proven.

The results of this chapter have first been published in [65].

5.1 The Ostrogradsky Formalism

The Hamiltonian formalism for Lagrangians with higher derivatives was formulated one and a half century ago by Ostrogradsky [25]. Since this formalism is not as well-known as the Hamiltonian formalism for Lagrangians with at most first derivatives, I will first briefly review it in this section taking also into account the case of singular higher-order Lagrangians [13, 66, 67], i.e. of Lagrangians which involve constraints. Furthermore, I will consider the quantization of higher-order Lagrangians within the Hamiltonian PI formalism. Then, using the Ostrogradsky formalism, I will show that Lagrangians which related to each other by field transformations involving derivatives are equivalent (at the classical and at the quantum level). For simplification I will restrict myself to the case of finitely many degrees of freedom; the generalization to field theory works as in the treatment of Lagrangians without higher derivatives.

Consider a Lagrangian of order N, i.e. a Lagrangian which depends on the coordinates q_i, (with $i = 1, \ldots, I$) and their derivatives up to the order N:

$$L(q_i, q_i^{(1)}, \ldots, q_i^{(N)}), \qquad \text{with} \qquad q_i^{(n)} \equiv \left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)^n q_i. \tag{5.1}$$

Within in the Ostrogradsky formalism one defines the coordinates as

$$Q_{i,n} \equiv q_i^{(n-1)}, \qquad n = 1, \ldots, N \tag{5.2}$$

($q_i^{(0)} \equiv q_i$), i.e. the $q_i^{(n)}$ with $n \leq N-1$ are formally treated as independent coordinates and only $q_i^{(N)}$ is treated as a derivative. The momenta are defined as

$$P_{i,n} \equiv \sum_{k=n}^{N} \left(-\frac{d}{dt}\right)^{k-n} \frac{\partial L}{\partial q_i^{(k)}}, \qquad n = 1, \ldots, N. \tag{5.3}$$

The Hamiltonian is given by

$$H \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{I} \sum_{n=1}^{N} P_{i,n} \dot{Q}_{i,n} - L = \sum_{i=1}^{I} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{N-1} P_{i,n} Q_{i,n+1} + P_{i,N} q_i^{(N)} \right) - L. \tag{5.4}$$

In (5.4), the $q_i^{(N)}$ ($i = 1, \ldots, I$) have to be expressed in terms of the $P_{i,N}$ by using (5.3) with $n = N$:

$$P_{i,N} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial q_i^{(N)}}. \tag{5.5}$$

In analogy to the treatment of first-order Lagrangians discussed in sect. 3.1, the theory is called nonsingular if the $I \times I$-matrix

$$M_{ij} \equiv \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial q_i^{(N)} \partial q_j^{(N)}} \tag{5.6}$$

is nonsingular. In this case (5.5) can be solved for all $q_i^{(N)}$.

For singular Lagrangians one finds

$$\operatorname{rank} M_{ij} = R < I. \tag{5.7}$$

The indices i, j can be ordered such that the upper left $R \times R$-submatrix of M has the rank R. In this case, the first R of the relations (5.5) can be solved for $q_i^{(N)}$ with $i = 1, \ldots, R$, while the remaining ones are the primary constraints. Nevertheless, H (5.4) does not depend on $q_i^{(N)}$ with $i = R+1, \ldots, I$ because

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial q_i^{(N)}} = P_{i,N} - \frac{\partial L}{\partial q_i^{(N)}} = 0, \qquad i = R+1, \ldots, I\,, \tag{5.8}$$

where the constraints (5.5) with $i = R+1, \ldots, I$ have been used. Furthermore, (5.7) implies that the first R of the relations (5.5) can be used to rewrite the remaining ones in a form which does not involve the $q_i^{(N)}$. Thus the Hamiltonian and the primary constraints are functions of the $Q_{i,n}$ and the $P_{i,n}$, $n = 1, \ldots, N$, alone. As in the first-order case, the Hamiltonian EOM have the form (3.12) with (3.13), where f may be $Q_{i,n}$, $P_{i,n}$ or an arbitrary function of these variables.

A higher-order Lagrangian can be quantized within the Hamilitonian PI formalism [9, 11, 12, 13] in analogy to a first-order Lagrangian. The Hamiltonian PI (3.30) turns out to be

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int \prod_{i=1}^{I} \prod_{n=1}^{N} (\mathcal{D}Q_{i,n} \mathcal{D}P_{i,n}) \exp\left\{ i \int d^4x \left[\sum_{i=1}^{I} \sum_{n=1}^{N} P_{i,n} \dot{Q}_{i,n} - H \right] \right\} \\ &\qquad \times \delta(\phi_a) \operatorname{Det}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\{\phi_a, \phi_b\} \delta(x^0 - y^0) \right) \end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

where the ϕ_a are the primary constraints (5.5) with $i = R+1, \ldots, I$, the secondary, tertiary, etc. constraints and the gauge-fixing conditions if there are first-class constraints.

For the following investigations it is important, that the Ostrogradsky formalism is not affected by changing the (formal) order N of the Lagrangian as long as N is greater or equal to the order of the highest derivative actually occurring in L. In other words, two physical systems, which are both given in terms of the same Lagrangian L, but in the one L is formally treated as an N-th order Lagrangian (within the Ostrogradsky formalism) and in the other as an M-th order one, are equivalent. This theorem was proven in [13]. I repeat this short proof here and, in addition, I show that also the Hamiltonian PIs corresponding to the two systems are identical.

In order to prove this theorem, it is sufficient to assume that $M = N + 1$. (The result for an arbitrary M follows then by induction.) Thus I treat the Lagrangian (5.1) (which does not depend on the $q_i^{(N+1)}$) formally as an $(N + 1)$st-order Lagrangian. One finds the canonical variables

$$\tilde{Q}_{i,n} = q_i^{(n-1)}, \qquad n = 1, \ldots, N+1, \tag{5.10}$$

$$\tilde{P}_{i,n} = \sum_{k=n}^{N+1} \left(-\frac{d}{dt} \right)^{k-n} \frac{\partial L}{\partial q_i^{(k)}}, \qquad n = 1, \ldots, N+1. \tag{5.11}$$

With $n = 1, \dots, N$, these equations become

$$\tilde{Q}_{i,n} = Q_{i,n}, \qquad \tilde{P}_{i,n} = P_{i,n}, \qquad n = 1, \dots, N, \tag{5.12}$$

i.e., these variables are identical to the corresponding ones obtained in the Nth-order formalism, (5.2) and (5.3). With $n = N+1$ one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q}_{i,N+1} &= q_i^{(N)}, & (5.13)\\ \tilde{P}_{i,N+1} &= \frac{\partial L}{\partial q_i^{(N+1)}} = 0. & (5.14) \end{aligned}$$

The Hamiltonian is given by

$$\tilde{H} = \sum_{i=1}^{I} \sum_{n=1}^{N+1} \tilde{P}_{i,n} \dot{\tilde{Q}}_{i,n} - L = \sum_{i=1}^{I} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \tilde{P}_{i,n} \tilde{Q}_{i,n+1} - L. \tag{5.15}$$

$\tilde{H}$ is identical to H (5.4), except that in H the $q_i^{(N)}$ are expressed in terms of the remaining variables by using (5.5), but in $\tilde{H}$ they are still present (because, due to (5.13), they are independent coordinates in the $(N+1)$st-order formalism). The $(N+1)$st-order system is singular; the relations (5.14) are the primary constaints. The requirement (3.10) that these constraints have to be consistent with the EOM yields the secondary constraints

$$\dot{\tilde{P}}_{i,N+1} = -\frac{\partial \tilde{H}}{\partial \tilde{Q}_{i,N+1}} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial q_i^{(N)}} - \tilde{P}_{i,N} = 0. \tag{5.16}$$

This is identical to the relation (5.5). Applying the constaints (5.16) with $i = 1, \dots, R$ in order to eliminate all $\tilde{Q}_{i,N+1}$ from the Hamiltonian $\tilde{H}$ and from the remaining constraints (5.16) (in analogy to the procedure outlined above) one finds

$$\tilde{H} = H. \tag{5.17}$$

Then the Lagrange multipliers corresponding to the constraints (5.16) with $i = 1, \dots, R$, which can be solved for $\tilde{Q}_{i,N+1}$, i.e. that can be rewritten as

$$\tilde{Q}_{i,N+1} - f_i(\tilde{Q}_{j,1}, \dots, \tilde{Q}_{j,N}, \tilde{P}_{j,N}) = 0 \qquad i = 1, \dots, R, \tag{5.18}$$

become zero in order to ensure $\dot{\tilde{P}}_{i,N+1} = 0$ (because $\tilde{H}$ and the other constraints do not depend on the $\tilde{Q}_{i,N+1}$ anymore). The remaining constraints in the $(N+1)$st-order formalism are identical to those obtained in the Nth-order formalism (because (5.5) and (5.16) are identical). Therefore, also the total Hamiltonians (3.13) which imply the EOM are identical[2]

$$\tilde{H}_T = H_T. \tag{5.19}$$

---

[2] Actually, $\tilde{H}_T$ contains an additional term $\lambda^i P_{i,N}$ due to the presence of the primary constraints (5.14). This however does not affect the EOM (3.12) for the variables $\tilde{Q}_{i,n}$ and $\tilde{P}_{i,n}$ with $n = 1, \dots, N$.

From (5.12) and (5.19) follows the equivalence of the Nth- and the $(N+1)$st-order Ostrogradsky formalism, i.e. the independence of the Ostrogradsky formalism from the choice of the (formal) order N of the Lagrangian L.

To extend this classical result to quantum physics, one has to show that the Hamiltonian PIs obtained within the Nth and the $(N+1)$st-order formalism are identical. In the $(N+1)$st-order formalism the Hamiltonian PI has the form

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{Z} \;&=\; \int \prod_{i=1}^{I}\prod_{n=1}^{N+1}(\mathcal{D}\tilde{Q}_{i,n}\mathcal{D}\tilde{P}_{i,n}) \exp\left\{ i\int d^4x \left[\sum_{i=1}^{I}\sum_{n=1}^{N+1} \tilde{P}_{i,n}\dot{\tilde{Q}}_{i,n} - \tilde{H} \right] \right\} \\ &\qquad\qquad \times \delta(\tilde{\phi}_a)\,\mathrm{Det}^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\{\tilde{\phi}_a,\tilde{\phi}_b\}\delta(x^0-y^0)\right). \qquad (5.20)\end{aligned}$$

The constraints and g.f. conditions $\tilde{\phi}_a$ include all the constraints and g.f. conditions ϕ_a obtained in the Nth-order formalism and, in addition, the constraints (5.14) and (5.18). The fundamental Poisson brackets imply that (5.14) with $i = 1,\ldots,R$ and (5.18) represent a system of second-class constraints, while the constraints (5.14) with $i = R+1,\ldots,I$, which have vanishing Poisson brackets with all other constraints, are first-class. Therefore one has to include gauge-fixing conditions corresponding to these first-class constraints into the $\tilde{\phi}_a$. A possible and suitable choice is

$$\tilde{Q}_{i,N+1} = 0, \qquad i = R+1,\ldots,I. \qquad (5.21)$$

Using the fundamental Poisson brackets and remembering that the ϕ_a do not depend on the $\tilde{Q}_{i,N+1}$ and the $\tilde{P}_{i,N+1}$, one finds

$$\mathrm{Det}\left(\{\tilde{\phi}_a,\tilde{\phi}_b\}\delta(x^0-y^0)\right) = \mathrm{Det}\left(\{\phi_a,\phi_b\}\delta(x^0-y^0)\right). \qquad (5.22)$$

Because of the presence of the δ-functions corresponding to the constraints (5.14) and (5.18) and to the g.f. conditions (5.21) in the PI one can carry out the functional integrations over the $\tilde{Q}_{i,N+1}$ and the $\tilde{P}_{i,N+1}$. Equations (5.12) and (5.17) imply then that the Hamiltonian PI (5.20) is identical to the one obtained in the Nth-order formalism (5.9). Thus, the Hamiltonian PI is also independent of the formal order N.

The conclusion of this section, which is most important for the subsequent investigations is the following: In the Nth-order formalism all derivatives up to the order $N-1$ are treated as independent coordinates and not as derivatives. Furthermore, the order N can be chosen arbitrarily high without affecting the physical content of the theory. This implies that each local coordinate transformation which involves derivatives of the coordinates (up to a finite order) can be considered to be a point transformation, i.e. a transformation which formally only depends on the coordinates but not on the derivatives. If one wants to apply a coordinate transformation involving derivatives up to the order N, one simply has to treat the Lagrangian as an $(N+1)$st-order one (even if no $(N+1)$st derivatives occur in L) so that this transformation can be identified as a point transformation. Such a transformation becomes a canonical transformation within the Hamiltonian framework because the fact that two Lagrangians are related to each other by a point transformation implies that the corresponding Hamiltonians and constraints are related to each other by a canonical transformation (if the order N is chosen sufficiently high); namely the canonical transformation corresponding to the point transformation

$$Q_{i,n} \to f_{i,n}(Q_{j,m}), \tag{5.23}$$

is (in analogy to the first-order formalism [52]) given by[3] (5.23) and

$$P_{i,n} \to \left(\frac{\partial f_{i,n}}{\partial Q_{j,m}}\right)^{-1} P_{j,m}. \tag{5.24}$$

Since the physical content of a theory is not affected by a canonical transformation, one finds that *Lagrangians, which are related to each other by a local coordinate transformation are physically equivalent even if this transformation involves derivatives.*

The Hamiltonian PIs corresponding to Lagrangians that are related by such a field transformation are identical because of the invariance of the Hamiltonian PI under canonical transformations[4] [9, 11, 12, 13] and its independence of the (formal) order N (see above). Therefore, *this equivalence is also valid in quantum physics.*

5.2 Reduction of Higher-Order Effective Lagrangians and the Hamilton–Lagrange Equivalence Theorem

In this section I will show that a higher-order effective Lagrangian can be reduced to a first-order one by applying the equations of motion to the effective interaction term. Using this reduction, I will prove the HLE theorem for effective Lagrangians with higher derivatives. For simplicity I will first only consider effective interactions of a scalar field.

I consider a Lagrangian of the form

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0 + \epsilon\mathcal{L}_I = \frac{1}{2}(\partial^\mu\varphi)(\partial_\mu\varphi) - \frac{1}{2}M^2\varphi^2 + \epsilon\mathcal{L}_I(\varphi, \partial^\mu\varphi, \ldots, \partial^{\mu_1}\cdots\partial^{\mu_N}\varphi). \tag{5.25}$$

$\mathcal{L}_I$ contains effective interactions of the scalar field φ which depend on the derivatives of φ up to the order N. These interactions are governed by the coupling constant ϵ with $\epsilon \ll 1$.

Now I want to remove all higher time derivatives from the effective interaction term by applying the EOM (upon neglecting higher powers of ϵ). This procedure must be carefully justified since, in general, the EOM must not be applied in order to convert the Lagrangian. Therefore, I use the results of [27, 28] where it was shown that it is always possible to find field transformations which effectively result in applying the EOM following from $\mathcal{L}_0$ to $\mathcal{L}_I$ (in first order of ϵ).

---

[3] This can easily be seen if the order N is chosen so high that the two Lagrangians related by the transformation (5.23) only depend on $Q_{i,n}$ with $n < N$ and that the transformations of the $Q_{i,n}$ which occur in the Lagrangians do not involve the $Q_{i,N}$. In analogy to the treatment of first-order Lagrangians one finds then that the Hamiltonians (5.4) and the primary constraints ($P_{i,N} = 0$ in this case) are related to each other by the canonical transformation (5.23), (5.24). The secondary, tertiary, etc. constraints follow from the Poisson brackets (3.10) which are invariant under canonical transformations.

[4] Within the *canonical* quantization formalism the invariance of the S-Matrix elements with respect to a point transformation of the Lagrangian was shown in [68].

This can be seen as follows: Assume that $\epsilon\mathcal{L}_I$ contains a term

$$\epsilon T\ddot{\varphi} \tag{5.26}$$

(where T is an arbitrary expression in φ and its derivatives), i.e. that (5.25) can be written as

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0 + \epsilon T\ddot{\varphi} + \epsilon\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_I \tag{5.27}$$

(with $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_I \equiv \mathcal{L}_I - T\ddot{\varphi}$). Making the field transformation [27, 28]

$$\varphi \rightarrow \varphi + \epsilon T \tag{5.28}$$

(and the corresponding transformations of the derivatives of φ) one finds (in first order of ϵ)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L} &= \mathcal{L}_0 + \epsilon\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}_0}{\partial\varphi}T + \epsilon\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}_0}{\partial(\partial^\mu\varphi)}(\partial^\mu T) + \epsilon T\ddot{\varphi} + \epsilon\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_I + O(\epsilon^2) \\
&= \mathcal{L}_0 + \epsilon T\ddot{\varphi} + \epsilon T\left(\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}_0}{\partial\varphi} - \partial^\mu\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}_0}{\partial(\partial^\mu\varphi)}\right) + \epsilon\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_I + O(\epsilon^2) \\
&= \mathcal{L}_0 + \epsilon T(\Delta\varphi - M^2\varphi) + \epsilon\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_I + O(\epsilon^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{5.29}$$

(after dropping a total derivative term[5]). This means that effectively the second time derivative has been removed from the term (5.26) by applying the free EOM (i.e. the EOM implied by $\mathcal{L}_0$ alone)

$$\ddot{\varphi} = \Delta\varphi - M^2\varphi. \tag{5.30}$$

If there are terms with higher than second time derivatives in $\epsilon\mathcal{L}_I$, they can be put into the form (5.26) by applying product differentiation and dropping total derivative terms. Repeating the above procedure, one can remove all higher time derivatives from the effective Lagrangian.

To prove that a higher-order effective Lagrangian and the first-order Lagrangian obtained from it by applying the above procedure are physically equivalent, I use the results of the previous section. The Lagrangians are connected by field transformations of the type (5.28) which, in general, involve derivatives of φ (contained in T). However, within the Ostrogradsky formalism these transformations are point (i.e. canonical) transformations (if the formal order of $\mathcal{L}$ is choosen sufficiently high) which establishes the equivalence of both Lagrangians. To be strictly correct, one must remember that, within the Ostrogradsky formalism, the time derivatives of φ are fields that are formally independent of φ. Therefore, the transformation (5.28) is completely specified by

$$\partial_0^n\varphi \rightarrow \partial_0^n(\varphi + \epsilon T), \qquad n = 0, \ldots, N, \tag{5.31}$$

---

[5] In general, only total derivatives of expressions that depend on nothing but the coordinates can be dropped. However, since the derivatives are treated as coordinates within the Ostrogradsky formalism if the order N is chosen sufficiently high (as discussed in the previous section), all total derivative terms can be neglected [13].

where N is the order of the highest time derivative occurring in $\mathcal{L}$ (5.25). Now one can easily see that, if T contains at most Mth time derivatives, the Lagrangian formally has to be treated as an $(N+M+2)$nd-order one so that (5.31) becomes a canonical transformation. The result of this procedure is that *the equations of motion imlied by $\mathcal{L}_0$ may be applied to convert the effective interaction term $\mathcal{L}_I$ in order to eliminate all higher time derivatives* (by neglecting higher powers of ϵ).

Now it is easy to quantize the effective Lagrangian (5.25) and to prove the HLE theorem, i.e. to derive the Lagrangian PI (1.1) with (1.2). The proof goes as follows:

1. Given an effective higher-order Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ (5.25), it can be reduced to an equivalent first-order[6] Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_{red}$ by applying field transformations such as (5.28). As discussed in section 5.1 this does not affect the Hamiltonian PI.
2. $\mathcal{L}_{red}$ can be quantized by applying the HLE theorem for first-order Lagrangians [10]. The resulting generating functional can be written as a Lagrangian PI
$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}\varphi \exp\left\{ i \int d^4x\, \mathcal{L}_{red} \right\}. \tag{5.32}$$
3. In the Lagrangian PI (5.32), the field transformations (5.28) are done inversely in order to reconstruct the primordial higher-order Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ (5.25). After the introduction of a source term this finally yields (1.1) with (1.2).

The last step needs some additional clarification because a field transformation like (5.28), if it is made in the PI (5.32), does not only affect the quantized Lagrangian, but also the integration measure. However, it was shown in [28] that the transformation of the measure only yields an extra $\delta^4(0)$-term which is neglected here. I briefly repeat here the derivation of this result in the second ref. in [28] because it is very similar to an argument that I have used several times in chapters 2 and 4: The functional Jacobian determinant corresponding to the transformation (5.28) which arises due to the change of the functional integration measure has the form

$$\mathrm{Det}\left(\frac{\delta(\varphi+\epsilon T)(x)}{\delta\varphi(y)}\right) = \mathrm{Det}\left(\delta^4(x-y) + \epsilon\frac{\delta T(x)}{\delta\varphi(y)}\right). \tag{5.33}$$

With T^L being the part of T which is linear in φ and with T^{NL} being the part, which contains the quadratic, cubic, etc. terms, one can rewrite (5.33) as

$$\mathrm{Det}\left(\delta^4(x-y) + \epsilon\frac{\delta T^{NL}(x)}{\delta\varphi(y)} + O(\epsilon^2)\right) \mathrm{Det}\left(\delta^4(x-y) + \epsilon\frac{\delta T^{L}(x)}{\delta\varphi(y)}\right). \tag{5.34}$$

Due to the definition of T^L, the second determinant in (5.34) is constant and can thus be neglected. Applying (2.16), the first one yields a ghost term

$$\mathcal{L}_{ghost} = -\eta^*\eta - \epsilon\eta^*\frac{\partial T^{NL}}{\partial\varphi}\eta + O(\epsilon^2). \tag{5.35}$$

---

[6] Formally, the reduced Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_{red}$ still has to be treated as an Nth-order one although it contains no more higher derivatives. But, as shown in section 5.1, it does not affect the physical content of the theory to treat it as a first-order Lagrangian.

$\mathcal{L}_{ghost}$ contains a mass term for the ghosts and couplings to the scalar field but no kinetic term. Therefore, using a similar argumentation as in section 2.2 one finds that all ghost loops are (at least) quartically divergent and thus the term (5.35) can be replaced by a $\delta^4(0)$-term.

The HLE theorem implies, that an *effective* higher-order Lagrangian can be quantized in the same way as a first-order one without worrying about the unphysical effects [26] that are normally connected with higher-order Lagrangians. In particular, the Feynman rules can be obtained in the standard manner from the effective interaction term.

Closing this section, I want to add several remarks:

- By repeating the above procedure, one can iteratively eleminate the higher derivatives in any finite order of ϵ [27, 28]. Thus, remembering the discussion at the beginning of chapter 4, one can see that also in the higher-order case the HLE theorem can in principle be proven in an arbitrary order of ϵ. However, by this iterative procedure one cannot eliminate the higher derivatives in all orders of ϵ.

- The procedure described in this section can only be applied to *effective* Lagrangians, since then the supposed existence of well-behaved "new physics" beyond the theory described by the effective Lagrangian justifies the omission of all unphysical effects. The above proof rests on the fact that higher derivative terms proportional to higher powers of ϵ are neglected (see the previous item). The assumption $\epsilon \ll 1$ alone is not sufficient for neglecting these terms since theories with higher derivatives have no analytic limit for $\epsilon \to 0$. Thus, the effects of a term with higher derivatives are not small even if the coupling constant of this term is extremely small [26]. However, as mentioned in the introduction, the neglect of these terms is justified when considering an effective Lagrangian because effects implied by $O(\epsilon^n)$-terms with $n > 1$ are assumed to be cancelled by other effects of (well-behaved) "new physics". This means that the unphysical features cannot be eliminated within models with higher derivatives that are *not* considered to be effective ones.

- In principle, the Ostrogradsky formalism itself is a reduction of a higher-order Lagrangian to a first-order one[7] because the higher derivatives are considered to be independent coordinates; however, this means that new degrees of freedom are introduced. These additional degrees of freedom involve the unphysical effects [26]. Here, an effective higher-order Lagrangian is reduced to a first-order one *without* introducing extra degrees of freedom and thus the unphysical effects are eliminated.

- The use of the EOM (5.30) may, in general, yield expressions in $\mathcal{L}_{red}$ which are not manifestly Lorentz invariant (see especially the treatment of vector fields in the following section). Also the Hamiltonian PI quantization procedure implies such terms (see [9, 10, 11, 12, 13] and chapter 4). However, these expressions only occur in intermediate steps of the derivation but not in the resulting PI (1.1) with (1.2). Actually, the HLE theorem enables calculations based on the manifestly Lorentz invariant Lagrangian PI.

---

[7] For a formal proof of this see [67].

- Since each effective Lagrangian with higher derivatives can be reduced to a first-order one, it is in principle sufficient to consider only effective Lagrangians with at most first derivatives [27, 28, 49, 69]. However, the reduction of a quite simple higher-order effective interaction term to a first-order term by applying the equations of motion, in general, yields a lengthy and awkward expression, which is a linear combination of several terms; each one alone of these terms yields effects that are not implied by the primordial term but among them complicated cancellations take place [49, 70]. This means the physical effects of such a higher-order term are quite untransparent after the application of the EOM. Thus, for practical calculations it is much more convenient to use the Feynman rules deriving from the the primordial higher-order Lagrangian instead of those implied by the reduced first-order Lagrangian. Therefore, I have used this reduction only for technical purposes in order to apply the HLE theorem for first-order Lagrangians, but in the final result (1.1) with (1.2) I have reconstructed the original higher-order Lagrangian. Actually, this result enables calculations based on a higher-order effective Lagrangian without doing this reduction.

5.3 Higher-Order Effective Interactions of Massive Vector Fields

In this section I will extend the results of the preceding one to higher-order effective (non Yang–Mills) self-interactions of massive vector fields. I will again examine the three different types of effective Lagrangians which are found in the literature, namely gauge noninvariant Lagrangians, gauged nonlinear σ-models and Higgs models. As in chapter 4 I will for simplicity only consider massive Yang–Mills theories (with additional effective interactions) in which all vector bosons have equal masses and the corresponding SBGTs.

5.3.1 Gauge Noninvariant Models

I consider the effective Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0 + \epsilon\mathcal{L}_I = -\frac{1}{4}F_a^{\mu\nu}F^a_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}M^2 A_a^\mu A^a_\mu + \epsilon\mathcal{L}_I(A_a^\mu, \partial^\nu A_a^\mu, \dots, \partial^{\nu_1}\cdots\partial^{\nu_N}A_a^\mu). \tag{5.36}$$

$\mathcal{L}_0$ represents a massive Yang–Mills theory and the effective interaction term $\mathcal{L}_I$ contains the deviations from the Yang–Mills interactions which involve derivatives up to the order N and which are proportional to ϵ with $\epsilon \ll 1$.

By applying the procedure described in section 5.2 one can now use the EOM following from $\mathcal{L}_0$ in order to eliminate the higher time derivatives in $\mathcal{L}_I$. The EOM are:

$$D_\mu F_a^{\mu\nu} = -M^2 A_a^\nu \tag{5.37}$$

with the covariant derivative

$$D^\sigma F_a^{\mu\nu} \equiv \partial^\sigma F_a^{\mu\nu} - g f_{abc} A_b^\sigma F_c^{\mu\nu}. \tag{5.38}$$

For $\nu = i = 1, 2, 3$ (5.37) can be written as

$$\ddot{A}^i_a = -M^2 A^i_a - D_j F^{ij}_a - g f_{abc} A^0_b F^{i0}_c - \partial_i \dot{A}^0_a - g f_{abc} (\dot{A}^i_b A^0_c + A^i_b \dot{A}^0_c). \tag{5.39}$$

This equation serves to eliminate all higher time derivatives of the A^i_a. Next one has to get rid of the time derivatives of the A^0_a. To be able to apply the HLE theorem for first-order Lagrangians derived in section 4.1, one even has to remove the first time derivatives of the A^0_a because in section 4.1 it is assumed that $\mathcal{L}$ does not depend on $\dot{A}^0_a$ (see footnote 2 there). For $\nu = 0$ (5.37) becomes

$$A^0_a = \frac{1}{M}[-\partial_i F^{i0}_a - g f_{abc} A^i_b F^{i0}_c]. \tag{5.40}$$

Differentiation yields

$$\dot{A}^0_a = \frac{1}{M}\big[-\partial_i \dot{F}^{i0}_a - g f_{abc} (\dot{A}^i_b F^{i0}_c + A^i_b \dot{F}^{i0}_c)\big], \tag{5.41}$$

where $\dot{F}^{i0}_a$ can be written (using (5.39)) as

$$\dot{F}^{i0}_a = M^2 A^i_a + D_j F^{ij} + g f_{abc} A^0_b F^{i0}_c. \tag{5.42}$$

By repeated application of (5.39), (5.41) and (5.42) one can reduce the effective Lagrangian (5.36) to an equivalent Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_{red}$ which contains neither higher time derivatives of the fields nor first time derivatives of the A^0_a.

Now the HLE theorem can be proven as in the previous section. The effective higher-order Lagrangian becomes reduced to a first-order Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_{red}$ as described above, this gets quantized by applying the HLE theorem for effective first-order interactions of massive vector fields (sect. 4.1) and finally one can reconstruct the primordial Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ by making the appropriate field transformations in the Lagrangian PI.

5.3.2 Gauged Nonlinear σ-Models

Now I consider SBGTs with additional effective interaction terms. First I restrict myself to gauged nonlinear σ-models; in these the unphysical pseudo-Goldstone fields φ_a are nonlinearly parametrized as (4.31) with (4.30).

Each effective gauged nonlinear σ-model can be rewritten in the gauge noninvariant form (5.36) by applying the inverse of the Stueckelberg transformation (4.32). This can be seen as follows: Due to the gauge invariance of the effective interaction term, the fields only occur there in the gauge invariant combinations

$$U^\dagger (D^{\sigma_1} \cdots D^{\sigma_N} F^{\mu\nu}) U, \tag{5.43}$$

$$U^\dagger D^{\sigma_1} \cdots D^{\sigma_N} U. \tag{5.44}$$

(The higher covariant derivatives of $F^{\mu\nu}$ and U are defined in analogy to the first-order ones, (4.33) and (5.38).) Each effective interaction term can be constructed from the expressions

(5.43), (5.44) and constants like t_a, $g^{\mu\nu}$ and $\epsilon^{\rho\sigma\mu\nu}$ by taking products, sums, derivatives and traces [41]. The term (5.43) becomes

$$D^{\sigma_1}\cdots D^{\sigma_N}F^{\mu\nu} \tag{5.45}$$

after an inverse Stueckelberg transformation. By using the unitarity of U ((4.31) with (4.30)) and by product differentiation, the term (5.44) can be expressed through terms

$$U^\dagger D^\mu U \tag{5.46}$$

and their derivatives. E.g. for $N=2$ it can be written as

$$U^\dagger D^{\sigma_1}D^{\sigma_2}U = (U^\dagger D^{\sigma_1}U)(U^\dagger D^{\sigma_2}U) + \partial^{\sigma_1}(U^\dagger D^{\sigma_2}U). \tag{5.47}$$

(Similar formulas can be found for $N>2$). (5.46) becomes

$$igA^\mu \tag{5.48}$$

after an inverse Stueckelberg transformation. This means that, by applying the inverse of the Stueckelberg transformation (4.32) (and of the corresponding transformations of the derivatives of A^μ), an arbitrary nonlinear gauge invariant Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}^S$ becomes a gauge noninvariant Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ (U-gauge Lagrangian) which is obtained by simply dropping all unphysical scalar fields in $\mathcal{L}^S$, i.e., $\mathcal{L}$ is given by (4.40).

In section 4.2 I have proven that Lagrangians (without higher derivatives) which are related to each other by a Stueckelberg transformation are equivalent within the Hamiltonian formalism. Using the Ostrogradsky formalism this result can be generalized to higher-order Lagrangians and besides it can be derived more easily. Since a Stueckelberg transformation is a field transformation that depends on the derivatives of the fields, it is a canonical transformation within this formalism[8] (if the formal order of $\mathcal{L}^S$ is chosen sufficiently high) as discussed in section 5.1. Since the time derivatives of A^μ are formally considered to be independent fields, the inverse Stueckelberg transformation is completely specified by

$$\partial_0^n A^\mu \to \partial_0^n\left(UA^\mu U^\dagger - \frac{i}{g}U\partial^\mu U^\dagger\right), \qquad n=0,\ldots,N \tag{5.49}$$

(with N being the order of the highest time derivative occurring in $\mathcal{L}^S$). The Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}^S$ has thus formally to be treated as an $(N+3)$rd-order one to establish the equivalence of $\mathcal{L}^S$ and $\mathcal{L}$.

The HLE theorem for effective gauged nonlinear σ-models with higher derivatives can now be proven as follows: Given a nonlinear gauge invariant Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}^S$, it can be converted into the equivalent gauge noninvariant U-gauge Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ (4.40) as described above. This does not affect the Hamiltonian path integral (see section 5.1). Since $\mathcal{L}$ is of the type (5.36), the results of the previous subsection can be applied to quantize it. In analogy to the treatment of section 4.2, this yields a generating functional which is equal to the one obtained in the (Lagrangian) Faddeev–Popov formalism if the g.f. conditions (4.53) are imposed. Due to the equivalence of all gauges [20, 23], this result can be rewritten in any other gauge. This yields (1.1) with (1.3).

---

[8] One may wonder why a gauge invariant (i.e. first-class constrained) system can be related to a gauge noninvariant (i.e. second-class constrained) system by a canonical transformation, because the number of second-class constraints is given by rank $\{\phi_a,\phi_b\}|_{\phi_a=0}$ which is invariant under canonical transformations. One should remember that these systems are only related by a canonical transformation if their order is artificially increased. This procedure yields additional constraints (see section 5.1). In fact, $\mathcal{L}^S$ and $\mathcal{L}$ imply equal numbers of first-class and of second-class constraints if their order is chosen sufficiently high.

5.3.3 Higgs Models

Finally let me consider effective SBGTs with linearly realized symmetry. As in sect. 4.3 I restrict myself to the case of SU(2) symmetry (i.e. $t_a = \frac{1}{2}\tau_a$, $a = 1, 2, 3$).

With the same arguments as in sections 4.3 and 5.3.2 one finds that, like in the first-order case, the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}^H$ of an effective Higgs model is equivalent to its U-gauge Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}^H_U$ given by (4.65). $\mathcal{L}^H_U$ is a gauge noninvariant Lagrangian such as (5.36) but it contains the additional physical scalar field h. Therefore it has the form

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}^H_U &= \mathcal{L}_0 + \epsilon\mathcal{L}_I \\
&= -\frac{1}{4}F^{\mu\nu}_a F^a_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}(\partial^\mu h)(\partial_\mu h) + \frac{1}{8}g^2(v+h)^2 A^\mu_a A^a_\mu - V(h, \varphi_a = 0) \\
&\quad + \epsilon\mathcal{L}_I(A^\mu_a, \partial^\nu A^\mu_a, \ldots, \partial^{\nu_1}\cdots\partial^{\nu_N}A^\mu_a, h, \partial^\mu h, \ldots, \partial^{\mu_1}\cdots\partial^{\mu_N}h). \qquad (5.50)
\end{aligned}$$

($\mathcal{L}_0$ is the U-gauge Lagrangian of the Higgs model without effective interaction terms.) The EOM corresponding to (5.39), (5.41), (5.42) and the EOM for the Higgs field implied by $\mathcal{L}_0$ are

$$\begin{aligned}
\ddot{A}^i_a &= -\frac{1}{4}g^2(v+h)^2 A^i_a - D_j F^{ij}_a - g f_{abc} A^0_b F^{i0}_c - \partial_i \dot{A}^0_a - g f_{abc}(\dot{A}^i_b A^0_c + A^i_b \dot{A}^0_c), \qquad (5.51) \\
\dot{A}^0_a &= \frac{4}{g^2(v+h)^2}\left[-\frac{1}{2}g^2(v+h)\dot{h}A^0_a - \partial_i \dot{F}^{i0}_a - g f_{abc}(\dot{A}^i_b F^{i0}_c + A^i_b \dot{F}^{i0}_c)\right], \qquad (5.52) \\
\dot{F}^{i0}_a &= \frac{1}{4}g^2(v+h)^2 A^i_a + D_j F^{ij} + g f_{abc} A^0_b F^{i0}_c, \qquad (5.53) \\
\ddot{h} &= \Delta h + \frac{1}{4}g^2(v+h)A^\mu_a A^a_\mu - \frac{\partial}{\partial h}V(h, \varphi_a = 0) \qquad (5.54)
\end{aligned}$$

These EOM can be used in order to eliminate all higher time derivatives of the A^μ_a and of h and also the first time derivatives of the A^0_a in $\mathcal{L}^H_U$ (5.50).

On the basis of this result, one can easily prove the HLE theorem for effective Higgs models by using the same arguments as in sections 4.3 and 5.3.2.

It should be mentioned that the transformation (4.63) and the EOM (5.52) involve non-polynomial interactions, which are not present in the primordial Lagrangian. This, however, is no serious problem, since these expressions only occur in intermediate steps of the derivation and not in the resulting Faddeev-Popov PI (1.1) with (1.3). The application of the HLE theorem for first-order Lagrangians is not affected by these terms, since the treatment of chapter 4 does not necessarily require polynomial interactions.

The derivation in this subsection illustrates that the above proof can be extended to the case of Lagrangians with matter fields which have been negelcted here for simplicity (also see the treatment of chapter 6). The additional couplings in $\mathcal{L}_0$ alter the EOM, but the general statement that each effective higher-order Lagrangian can be reduced to a first-order one by using the EOM remains unaffected. Therefore, the HLE theorem holds for any Lagrangian with arbitrary interactions of massive vector fields.

Chapter 6

Effective Gauge Theories

After the derivation of the HLE theorem for effective interactions of massive vector fields in the preceding two chapters, I will now also consider massless vector fields and fermion fields, which completes the proof of the HLE theorem for the physically most important types of particles.

As pointed out in the introduction, massless vector fields necessarily have to be understood as gauge fields; therefore I will give a general proof of the HLE theorem for gauge theories with effective (but still gauge invariant) gauge-boson self-interactions and with effective couplings to fermion and scalar fields. The result (1.1) with (1.3) will first be derived within the Coulomb gauge and then be generalized to any other gauge by using the equivalence of all gauges [20, 23]. This proof is also valid for SBGTs (both with linearly and with nonlinearly realized symmetry) i.e., gauge theories in which the gauge bosons are massive. Thus, this thesis contains two alternative proofs of the HLE theorem for effective SBGTs, the one given in the previous two chapters and the one presented in this chapter. Both are conceptionally different; in the first proof an SBGT is related to a gauge noninvariant Lagrangian (U-gauge Lagrangian) by applying the Stueckelberg formalism (actually, the reformulation of the Stueckelberg formalism and the construction of the U-gauge within the Hamiltonian framework is an important result by itsself) while the proof in this chapter is more direct and does not use the Stueckelberg formalism. This proof also applies to SBGTs in which not all gauge bosons are massive (like effective electroweak models [2, 3]) and, of course, to gauge theories without spontaneous symmetry breaking (like theories with effective gluon self-interactions [4]).

As in the previous two chapters, I will first consider effective Lagrangians without higher time derivatives and then I will generalize the HLE theorem to the higher-order case by using the EOM in order to eleminate the higher time derivatives from the effective interaction term. Actually, this simplifies the treatment of fermion fields very much, because, by applying the EOM, one can eliminate not only higher but also first time derivatives of these fields from the effective interaction term and therefore it is sufficient to prove the HLE theorem for effective interactions that do not involve time derivatives of the fermion fields.

The results of this chapter have first been published in [71].

6.1 The Hamilton–Lagrange Equivalence Theorem for Effective Gauge Theories

In this section I quantize an effective gauge theory (including fermion and scalar fields) without higher derivatives in the Hamiltonian PI formalism in order to derive the Faddeev–Popov PI (1.1) with (1.3). Some of the techniques used in the following derivation originate from the quantization of a Yang–Mills theory without effective interaction terms in [13] and some others from the quantization of gauge noninvariant effective Lagrangians in [10] and in section 4.1.

The effective Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0 + \epsilon\mathcal{L}_I = -\frac{1}{4}F^{\mu\nu}_a F^a_{\mu\nu} + i\bar{\psi}_a\gamma^\mu D_\mu\psi_a + (D^\mu\varphi^\dagger_a)(D_\mu\varphi_a) - V(\psi_a, \bar{\psi}_a, \varphi_a, \varphi^\dagger_a) + \epsilon\mathcal{L}_I. \quad (6.1)$$

The field strength tensor $F^a_{\mu\nu}$ is given by (4.2) and its covariant derivative by (5.38). The covariant derivatives of the ψ_a, $\bar{\psi}_a$, φ_a and $\varphi^\dagger_a$ are:

$$\begin{aligned} D_\mu\psi_a &\equiv \partial_\mu\psi_a + igA^c_\mu t^{ab}_c\psi_b, && (6.2)\\ D_\mu\bar{\psi}_a &\equiv \overline{(D_\mu\psi_a)}, && (6.3)\\ D_\mu\varphi_a &\equiv \partial_\mu\varphi_a + igA^c_\mu\bar{t}^{ab}_c\varphi_b, && (6.4)\\ D_\mu\varphi^\dagger_a &\equiv (D_\mu\varphi_a)^\dagger. && (6.5) \end{aligned}$$

(Higher covariant derivatives are defined analogously.) g is the gauge coupling constant, f_{abc} are the structure constants and t^{ab}_c and $\bar{t}^{ab}_c$ are the generators of the gauge group in its representation in the fermion sector and in the scalar sector respectively. $V(\psi_a, \bar{\psi}_a, \varphi_a, \varphi^\dagger_a)$ contains derivative-free interactions of the fermion and scalar fields, viz. Yukawa couplings and scalar self-interactions.

The effective interaction term $\epsilon\mathcal{L}_I$, which parametrizes the deviations from the minimal gauge theory (given by $\mathcal{L}_0$), contains arbitrary interactions of the fields which are governed by the effective coupling constant ϵ with $\epsilon \ll 1$. As pointed out in the introduction, an effective Lagrangian like (6.1) only has a physical meaning if the effective interaction term is gauge invariant. The gauge invariance implies that *the gauge fields A^a_μ do not occur arbitrarily in $\mathcal{L}_I$ but only through the field strength tensor and through covariant derivatives.* Furthermore, in this section I assume that *$\mathcal{L}_I$ does neither depend on higher time derivatives of the fields nor on first time derivatives of the A^a_0*[1] *and of the fermion fields ψ_a and $\bar{\psi}_a$.* The case of interactions with higher derivatives will be treated in the next section.

From (6.1) one finds the conjugate fields (generalized momenta):

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^a_0 &= \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\dot{A}^0_a} = 0, && (6.6)\\ \pi^a_i &= \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\dot{A}^i_a} = F^a_{i0} + \epsilon\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}_I}{\partial\dot{A}^i_a} = \dot{A}^i_a + \partial_i A^a_0 - gf_{abc}A^b_i A^c_0 + \epsilon\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}_I}{\partial\dot{A}^i_a}, && (6.7) \end{aligned}$$

---

[1] Actually, the absence of $\dot{A}^a_0$ already follows from the gauge invariance and the requirement that no higher time derivatives occur in $\mathcal{L}_I$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi^a_\psi &= \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\dot{\psi}_a} = i\bar{\psi}_a\gamma^0, && (6.8)\\
\pi^a_{\bar{\psi}} &= \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\dot{\bar{\psi}}_a} = 0, && (6.9)\\
\pi^a_\varphi &= \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\dot{\varphi}_a} = D_0\varphi^\dagger_a + \epsilon\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}_I}{\partial\dot{\varphi}_a} = \dot{\varphi}^\dagger_a - igA^c_0\bar{t}^{ba}_c\varphi^\dagger_b + \epsilon\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}_I}{\partial\dot{\varphi}_a}, && (6.10)\\
\pi^a_{\varphi^\dagger} &= \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\dot{\varphi}^\dagger_a} = D_0\varphi_a + \epsilon\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}_I}{\partial\dot{\varphi}^\dagger_a} = \dot{\varphi}_a + igA^c_0\bar{t}^{ab}_c\varphi_b + \epsilon\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}_I}{\partial\dot{\varphi}^\dagger_a}. && (6.11)
\end{aligned}$$

The relations (6.6), (6.8) and (6.9) do not contain ϵ-terms due to the assumption that $\mathcal{L}_I$ does not depend on $\dot{A}^a_0$, $\dot{\psi}_a$ and $\dot{\bar{\psi}}_a$. These relations cannot be solved for the velocities; they are constraints. The remaining of the above equations can be solved for the velocities, they become (in first order of ϵ):

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{A}^i_a &= \pi^a_i - \partial_i A^a_0 + gf_{abc}A^b_iA^c_0 - \epsilon\left.\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}_I}{\partial\dot{A}^i_a}\right|_{\substack{F^a_{i0}\to\pi^a_i\\ D_0\varphi^\dagger_a\to\pi^a_\varphi\\ D_0\varphi_a\to\pi^a_{\varphi^\dagger}}} + O(\epsilon^2), && (6.12)\\
\dot{\varphi}^\dagger_a &= \pi^a_\varphi + igA^c_0\bar{t}^{ba}_c\varphi^\dagger_b - \epsilon\left.\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}_I}{\partial\dot{\varphi}_a}\right|_{\substack{F^a_{i0}\to\pi^a_i\\ D_0\varphi^\dagger_a\to\pi^a_\varphi\\ D_0\varphi_a\to\pi^a_{\varphi^\dagger}}} + O(\epsilon^2), && (6.13)\\
\dot{\varphi}_a &= \pi^a_{\varphi^\dagger} - igA^c_0\bar{t}^{ab}_c\varphi_b - \epsilon\left.\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}_I}{\partial\dot{\varphi}^\dagger_a}\right|_{\substack{F^a_{i0}\to\pi^a_i\\ D_0\varphi^\dagger_a\to\pi^a_\varphi\\ D_0\varphi_a\to\pi^a_{\varphi^\dagger}}} + O(\epsilon^2). && (6.14)
\end{aligned}$$

One finds the Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H} &= \pi^a_\mu\dot{A}^\mu_a + \pi^a_\psi\dot{\psi}_a + \dot{\bar{\psi}}_a\pi^a_{\bar{\psi}} + \pi^a_\varphi\dot{\varphi}_a + \pi^a_{\varphi^\dagger}\dot{\varphi}^\dagger_a - \mathcal{L}\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\pi^a_i\pi^a_i - \pi^a_i\partial_iA^a_0 + gf_{abc}\pi^a_iA^b_iA^c_0 + \frac{1}{4}F^a_{ij}F^a_{ij}\\
&\quad -igA^c_0t^{ab}_c(\pi^a_\psi\psi_b - \bar{\psi}_a\pi^b_{\bar{\psi}}) + i\bar{\psi}_a\gamma_iD_i\psi_a\\
&\quad +\pi^a_{\varphi^\dagger}\pi^a_\varphi - igA^c_0\bar{t}^{ab}_c(\pi^a_\varphi\varphi_b - \varphi^\dagger_a\pi^b_{\varphi^\dagger}) + (D_i\varphi^\dagger_a)(D_i\varphi_a) + V\\
&\quad -\epsilon\bar{\mathcal{L}}_I(A^a_i, \psi_a, \bar{\psi}_a, \varphi_a, \varphi^\dagger_a, \pi^a_i, \pi^a_\varphi, \pi^a_{\varphi^\dagger}) + O(\epsilon^2) && (6.15)
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}_I(A^a_i, \psi_a, \bar{\psi}_a, \varphi_a, \varphi^\dagger_a, \pi^a_i, \pi^a_\varphi, \pi^a_{\varphi^\dagger}) \equiv \mathcal{L}_i\Big|_{\substack{F^a_{i0}\to\pi^a_i\\ D_0\varphi^\dagger_a\to\pi^a_\varphi\\ D_0\varphi_a\to\pi^a_{\varphi^\dagger}}}. \qquad (6.16)$$

One can use the identities

$$[D_\mu, D_\nu]\psi_a = igF^c_{\mu\nu}t^{ab}_c\psi_b, \qquad (6.17)$$

$$\begin{aligned}[D_\mu, D_\nu]\varphi_a &= igF^c_{\mu\nu}\bar{t}^{ab}_c\varphi_b, && (6.18)\\ [D_\mu, D_\nu]F^a_{\kappa\lambda} &= -gf_{abc}F^b_{\mu\nu}F^c_{\kappa\lambda} && (6.19)\end{aligned}$$

(and the corresponding relations for $\bar{\psi}_a$ and $\varphi^\dagger_a$) in order to rewrite those expressions in $\mathcal{L}_I$, in which time and spatial covariant derivatives act on the fields, such that the time derivatives are applied first. Remembering the discussion of the paragraph preceding equation (6.6) one can then easily see that $\mathcal{L}_I$ depends on the fields A^a_0 only through the expressions

$$F^a_{i0}, \qquad D_0F^a_{ij}, \qquad D_0\varphi_a, \qquad D_0\varphi^\dagger_a. \tag{6.20}$$

Using the Bianchi identity

$$D_\lambda F^a_{\mu\nu} + D_\mu F^a_{\nu\lambda} + D_\nu F^a_{\lambda\mu} = 0 \tag{6.21}$$

in order to rewrite $D_0F^a_{ij}$ as

$$D_0F^a_{ij} = D_jF^a_{i0} - D_iF^a_{j0} \tag{6.22}$$

and the definition (6.16) one finds that $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_I$ does not depend on the A^a_0. Thus, the gauge invariance and the absence of higher time derivatives (and of first time derivatives of A^a_0, ψ_a and $\bar{\psi}_a$) in $\mathcal{L}_I$ yields

$$\frac{\partial\bar{\mathcal{L}}_I}{\partial A^a_0} = 0. \tag{6.23}$$

As mentioned above, the relations (6.6), (6.8) and (6.9) imply the primary constraints

$$\begin{aligned}\phi^a_1 &= \pi^a_0 = 0, && (6.24)\\ \phi^a_\psi &= \pi^a_\psi - i\bar{\psi}_a\gamma^0 = 0, && (6.25)\\ \phi^a_{\bar{\psi}} &= \pi^a_{\bar{\psi}} = 0. && (6.26)\end{aligned}$$

The requirement (3.10) in general yields secondary constraints (see sect. 3.1). Actually, (6.25) and (6.26) do not imply secondary constraints, since the demand (3.10) only determines the Lagrange multipliers corresponding to these constraints [13]. The constraints (6.24) imply the secondary constraints

$$\phi^a_2 = \partial_i\pi^a_i + gf_{abc}\pi^b_iA^c_i - igt^{bc}_a(\pi^b_\psi\psi_c - \bar{\psi}_b\pi^c_{\bar{\psi}}) - ig\bar{t}^{bc}_a(\pi^b_\varphi\varphi_c - \varphi^\dagger_b\pi^c_{\varphi^\dagger}) = 0. \tag{6.27}$$

Due to (6.23), these secondary constraints do not contain $O(\epsilon)$-terms, i.e. they are independent of the form of the effective interaction term $\mathcal{L}_I$ (in first order of ϵ). There are no tertiary, etc. constraints. The Poisson brackets

$$\begin{aligned}\{\phi^a_\psi(\mathbf{x}), \phi^b_\psi(\mathbf{y})\} &= \{\phi^a_{\bar{\psi}}(\mathbf{x}), \phi^b_{\bar{\psi}}(\mathbf{y})\} = 0 && (6.28)\\ \{\phi^a_\psi(\mathbf{x}), \phi^b_{\bar{\psi}}(\mathbf{y})\} &= -i\gamma^0\delta^{ab}\delta^3(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}) && (6.29)\end{aligned}$$

imply that the constraints ϕ^a_ψ (6.25) and $\phi^a_{\bar{\psi}}$ (6.26) are second-class and the Poisson brackets

$$\begin{aligned}\{\phi^a_1(\mathbf{x}), \phi^b_1(\mathbf{y})\} &= \{\phi^a_1(\mathbf{x}), \phi^b_2(\mathbf{y})\} = \{\phi^a_1(\mathbf{x}), \phi^b_\psi(\mathbf{y})\} = \{\phi^a_1(\mathbf{x}), \phi^b_{\bar{\psi}}(\mathbf{y})\} = 0, && (6.30)\\ \{\phi^a_2(\mathbf{x}), \phi^b_2(\mathbf{y})\} &= gf_{abc}\phi^c_2(\mathbf{x})\delta^3(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}), && (6.31)\\ \{\phi^a_2(\mathbf{x}), \phi^b_\psi(\mathbf{y})\} &= -igt^{cb}_a\phi^c_\psi(\mathbf{x})\delta^3(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}), && (6.32)\\ \{\phi^a_2(\mathbf{x}), \phi^b_{\bar{\psi}}(\mathbf{y})\} &= igt^{cb}_a\phi^c_{\bar{\psi}}(\mathbf{x})\delta^3(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}) && (6.33)\end{aligned}$$

imply that the constraints ϕ_1^a (6.24) and ϕ_2^a (6.27) are first-class (see sect. 3.1).

Due to the presence of the first-class constraints one has to introduce an equal number of gauge-fixing conditions (as discussed in section 3.1). Following the reasoning of section 4.2, one finds that the usual Lorentz g.f. conditions

$$\chi_1^a = \partial^\mu A_\mu^a - C^a = 0 \tag{6.34}$$

(and also the R$_\xi$-g.f. conditions for SBGTs) are not g.f. conditions within the Hamiltonian formalism [9, 11, 12, 13] because they are not relations among the fields and the conjugate fields alone. Therefore I quantize the effective gauge theory (6.1) within the Coulomb gauge, i.e. by choosing the primary g.f. conditions

$$\chi_1^a = \partial^i A_i^a - C^a = 0. \tag{6.35}$$

(Instead of the Coulomb gauge, one can alternatively choose the axial gauge or, for SBGTs, the U-gauge as in section 4.2). The demand (3.21) yields the secondary g.f. conditions

$$\chi_2^a = \Delta A_0^a - \partial_i \pi_i^a - g f_{abc} \partial_i (A_i^b A_0^c) + \epsilon \partial_i \frac{\partial \bar{\mathcal{L}}_I}{\partial \pi_i^a} = 0. \tag{6.36}$$

The Hamiltonian path intergral (3.30) for this system is

$$\begin{aligned} Z \;=\; & \int \mathcal{D}A_\mu^a \mathcal{D}\psi_a \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi}_a \mathcal{D}\varphi_a \mathcal{D}\varphi_a^\dagger \mathcal{D}\pi_\mu^a \mathcal{D}\pi_\psi^a \mathcal{D}\pi_{\bar{\psi}}^a \mathcal{D}\pi_\varphi^a \mathcal{D}\pi_{\varphi^\dagger}^a \\ & \times \exp\left\{ i \int d^4x \left[\pi_\mu^a \dot{A}_a^\mu + \pi_\psi^a \dot{\psi}_a + \dot{\bar{\psi}}_a \pi_{\bar{\psi}}^a + \pi_\varphi^a \dot{\varphi}_a + \pi_{\varphi^\dagger}^a \dot{\varphi^\dagger}_a - \mathcal{H} \right] \right\} \\ & \times \delta(\phi_\psi^a) \delta(\phi_{\bar{\psi}}^a) \delta(\phi_1^a) \delta(\phi_2^a) \delta(\chi_1^a) \delta(\chi_2^a) \\ & \times \mathrm{Det}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\{\phi_{2nd}^a(\mathbf{x}), \phi_{2nd}^b(\mathbf{y})\} \delta(x^0 - y^0) \right) \mathrm{Det} \left(\{\phi_{1st}^a(\mathbf{x}), \chi^b(\mathbf{y})\} \delta(x^0 - y^0) \right) \end{aligned} \tag{6.37}$$

(where $\phi_{2nd}^a = (\phi_\psi^a, \phi_{\bar{\psi}}^a)$, $\phi_{1st}^a = (\phi_1^a, \phi_2^a)$ and $\chi^a = (\chi_1^a, \chi_2^a)$ denote *all* second-class constraints, first-class constraints and g.f. conditions respectively). First let me consider the determinants occurring in (6.37). Equations (6.28) and (6.29) imply

$$\mathrm{Det}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\{\phi_{2nd}^a(\mathbf{x}), \phi_{2nd}^b(\mathbf{y})\} \delta(x^0 - y^0) \right) = \text{constant}. \tag{6.38}$$

Therefore, this term can be neglected in the PI. Furthermore, one finds

$$\{\phi_1^a(\mathbf{x}), \chi_1^b(\mathbf{y})\} \;=\; 0, \tag{6.39}$$

$$-\{\phi_1^a(\mathbf{x}), \chi_2^b(\mathbf{y})\} = \{\phi_2^a(\mathbf{x}), \chi_1^b(\mathbf{y})\} \;=\; (\delta_{ab}\Delta + g f_{abc}(\partial_i A_i^c) + g f_{abc} A_i^c \partial_i) \delta^3(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}). \tag{6.40}$$

The absence of $O(\epsilon)$-terms in (6.40) is again a consequence of (6.23). This yields

$$\mathrm{Det} \left(\{\phi_{1st}^a(\mathbf{x}), \chi^b(\mathbf{y})\} \delta(x^0 - y^0) \right) = \mathrm{Det}^2 \left[(\delta_{ab}\Delta + g f_{abc}(\partial_i A_i^c) + g f_{abc} A_i^c \partial_i) \delta^4(x - y) \right]. \tag{6.41}$$

Next, one observes that $\mathcal{H}$ (6.15) contains a term $A_0^a \phi_2^a$. Due to the presence of $\delta(\phi_2^a)$ in the PI this term can be omitted. Then one integrates over π_0^a, π_ψ^a and $\pi_{\bar{\psi}}^a$ and finds

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int \mathcal{D}A_\mu^a \mathcal{D}\psi_a \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi}_a \mathcal{D}\varphi_a \mathcal{D}\varphi_a^\dagger \mathcal{D}\pi_i^a \mathcal{D}\pi_\varphi^a \mathcal{D}\pi_{\varphi^\dagger}^a \\ &\quad \times \exp\Big\{ i \int d^4x \Big[-\frac{1}{2}\pi_i^a \pi_i^a + \pi_i^a \dot{A}_a^i - \frac{1}{4} F_{ij}^a F_{ij}^a \\ &\quad +i\bar{\psi}_a \gamma^0 \dot{\psi}_a - i\psi_a \gamma_i D_i \psi_a - \pi_\varphi^a \pi_{\varphi^\dagger}^a + \pi_\varphi^a \dot{\varphi}_a + \pi_{\varphi^\dagger}^a \dot{\varphi}_a^\dagger - (D_i \varphi_a^\dagger)(D_i \varphi_a) - V \\ &\quad +\epsilon \bar{\mathcal{L}}_I (A_i^a, \psi_a, \bar{\psi}_a, \varphi_a, \varphi_a^\dagger, \pi_i^a, \pi_\varphi^a, \pi_{\varphi^\dagger}^a) \Big] \Big\} \\ &\quad \times \delta(\tilde{\phi}_2^a) \delta(\chi_1^a) \delta(\chi_2^a) \, \mathrm{Det}\,(\{\phi_{1st}^a(\mathbf{x}), \chi^b(\mathbf{y})\} \delta(x^0 - y^0)) \end{aligned} \tag{6.42}$$

with

$$\tilde{\phi}_2^a = \partial_i \pi_i^a + g f_{abc} \pi_i^b A_i^c + g \bar{\psi}^b \gamma^0 t_a^{bc} \psi_c - i g \bar{t}_a^{bc} (\pi_\varphi^b \varphi_c - \varphi_b^\dagger \pi_{\varphi^\dagger}^c) = 0. \tag{6.43}$$

After rewriting

$$\delta(\chi_2^a) = \delta(A_0^a - \tilde{A}_0^a) \, \mathrm{Det}^{-1} [(\delta_{ab} \Delta + g f_{abc} (\partial_i A_i^c) + g f_{abc} A_i^c \partial_i) \delta^4(x - y)] \tag{6.44}$$

(where $\tilde{A}_0^a$ is the solution of the differential equation (6.36)[2] with the boundary condition that $\tilde{A}_0^a$ vanishes for $|\mathbf{x}| \to \infty$) one can also integrate over A_0^a. Due to (6.23), the argument of the determinant in (6.44) does not contain $O(\epsilon)$-terms and, besides, the integration over A_0^a does not affect $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_I$. Next one reintroduces the variables A_0^a by using

$$\delta(\tilde{\phi}_2^a) = \int \mathcal{D}A_0^a \, \exp\left\{ -i \int d^4x \, A_0^a \tilde{\phi}_2^a \right\} \tag{6.45}$$

and gets

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int \mathcal{D}A_\mu^a \mathcal{D}\psi_a \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi}_a \mathcal{D}\varphi_a \mathcal{D}\varphi_a^\dagger \mathcal{D}\pi_i^a \mathcal{D}\pi_\varphi^a \mathcal{D}\pi_{\varphi^\dagger}^a \\ &\quad \times \exp\Big\{ i \int d^4x \Big[-\frac{1}{2}\pi_i^a \pi_i^a + \pi_i^a F_{i0}^a - \frac{1}{4} F_{ij}^a F_{ij}^a \\ &\quad +i\psi_a \gamma^\mu D_\mu \psi_a - \pi_\varphi^a \pi_{\varphi^\dagger}^a + \pi_\varphi^a D_0 \varphi_a + \pi_{\varphi^\dagger}^a D_0 \varphi_a^\dagger - (D_i \varphi_a^\dagger)(D_i \varphi_a) - V \\ &\quad +\epsilon \bar{\mathcal{L}}_I (A_i^a, \psi_a, \bar{\psi}_a, \varphi_a, \varphi_a^\dagger, \pi_i^a, \pi_\varphi^a, \pi_{\varphi^\dagger}^a) \Big] \Big\} \\ &\quad \times \delta(\partial^i A_i^a - C^a) \, \mathrm{Det}\, [(\delta_{ab} \Delta + g f_{abc} (\partial_i A_i^c) + g f_{abc} A_i^c \partial_i) \delta^4(x - y)]. \end{aligned} \tag{6.46}$$

In order to obtain expressions quadratic in the momenta, one rewrites this as

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}A_\mu^a \mathcal{D}\psi_a \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi}_a \mathcal{D}\varphi_a \mathcal{D}\varphi_a^\dagger$$

---

[2] One should not be confused by the occurrence of the nonlocal expression $\tilde{A}_0^a$. Since the integrand of the PI (6.42) is independent of A_0^a except for the factor $\delta(A_0^a - \tilde{A}_0^a)$, the $\tilde{A}_0^a$ become eliminated from the PI after the integration over A_0^a.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\times \exp\left\{ i\epsilon \int d^4x\, \bar{\mathcal{L}}_I \left(A_i^a, \psi_a, \bar{\psi}_a, \varphi_a, \varphi_a^\dagger, \frac{\delta}{i\delta K_i^a}, \frac{\delta}{i\delta K_\varphi^a}, \frac{\delta}{i\delta K_{\varphi^\dagger}^a} \right) \right\} \\
&\times \int \mathcal{D}\pi_i^a \mathcal{D}\pi_\varphi^a \mathcal{D}\pi_{\varphi^\dagger}^a \exp\left\{ i \int d^4x \left[-\frac{1}{2}\pi_i^a\pi_i^a + \pi_i^a F_{i0}^a - \frac{1}{4}F_{ij}^a F_{ij}^a \right.\right. \\
&\quad + i\psi_a \gamma^\mu D_\mu \psi_a - \pi_\varphi^a \pi_{\varphi^\dagger}^a + \pi_\varphi^a D_0 \varphi_a + \pi_{\varphi^\dagger}^a D_0 \varphi_a^\dagger - (D_i\varphi_a^\dagger)(D_i\varphi_a) - V \\
&\quad \left.\left. + K_i^a \pi_i^a + K_\varphi^a \pi_\varphi^a + K_{\varphi^\dagger}^a \pi_{\varphi^\dagger}^a \right] \right\} \Bigg|_{K_i^a = K_\varphi^a = K_{\varphi^\dagger}^a = 0} \\
&\times \delta(\partial^i A_i^a - C^a)\, \mathrm{Det}\left[(\delta_{ab}\Delta + g f_{abc}(\partial_i A_i^c) + g f_{abc} A_i^c \partial_i)\delta^4(x-y) \right]. \qquad (6.47)
\end{aligned}$$

Now one can carry out the Gaussian integrations over the momenta. With $\mathcal{L}_0$ given in (6.1) one finds

$$\begin{aligned}
Z &= \int \mathcal{D}A_\mu^a \mathcal{D}\psi_a \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi}_a \mathcal{D}\varphi_a \mathcal{D}\varphi_a^\dagger \exp\left\{ i \int d^4x\, \mathcal{L}_0 \right\} \\
&\quad \times \exp\left\{ i\epsilon \int d^4x\, \bar{\mathcal{L}}_I \left(A_i^a, \psi_a, \bar{\psi}_a, \varphi_a, \varphi_a^\dagger, \frac{\delta}{i\delta K_i^a}, \frac{\delta}{i\delta K_\varphi^a}, \frac{\delta}{i\delta K_{\varphi^\dagger}^a} \right) \right\} \\
&\quad \times \exp\left\{ i \int d^4x \left[\frac{1}{2} K_i^a K_i^a + K_\varphi^a K_{\varphi^\dagger}^a + K_i^a F_{i0}^a + K_\varphi^a D_0 \varphi_a^\dagger + K_{\varphi^\dagger}^a D_0 \varphi_a \right] \right\} \Bigg|_{K_i^a = K_\varphi^a = K_{\varphi^\dagger}^a = 0} \\
&\quad \times \delta(\partial^i A_i^a - C^a)\, \mathrm{Det}\left[(\delta_{ab}\Delta + g f_{abc}(\partial_i A_i^c) + g f_{abc} A_i^c \partial_i)\delta^4(x-y) \right]. \qquad (6.48)
\end{aligned}$$

This expression can be simplified in complete analogy to the procedure described in section 4.1. One finds (by neglecting $O(\epsilon^2)$- and $\delta^4(0)$-terms)

$$\begin{aligned}
Z &= \int \mathcal{D}A_\mu^a \mathcal{D}\psi_a \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi}_a \mathcal{D}\varphi_a \mathcal{D}\varphi_a^\dagger \exp\left\{ i \int d^4x \left[\mathcal{L}_0 + \epsilon \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_I \right] \right\} \\
&\quad \times \delta(\partial^i A_i^a - C^a)\, \mathrm{Det}\left[(\delta_{ab}\Delta + g f_{abc}(\partial_i A_i^c) + g f_{abc} A_i^c \partial_i)\delta^4(x-y) \right], \qquad (6.49)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_I$ turns out to be

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_I = \bar{\mathcal{L}}_I \Bigg|_{\substack{\pi_i^a \to F_{i0}^a \\ \pi_\varphi^a \to D_0 \varphi_a^\dagger \\ \pi_{\varphi^\dagger}^a \to D_0 \varphi_a}} = \mathcal{L}_I. \qquad (6.50)$$

(6.49) with (6.50) is identical to the result obtained within the (Lagrangian) Faddeev–Popov formalism by choosing the (Coulomb) g.f. conditions χ_1^a (6.35) because the change of χ_1^a under variations of the gauge parameters α_a is

$$\frac{\delta \chi_1^a(x)}{\delta \alpha_b(y)} = (\delta_{ab}\Delta + g f_{abc}(\partial_i A_i^c) + g f_{abc} A_i^c \partial_i)\delta^4(x-y). \qquad (6.51)$$

To derive the form (1.1) of the generating functional (with (1.3)) one has to construct a g.f. term by using the δ-fuction and to write the determinant as an exponential function by introducing ghost fields, as discussed in section 2.1. Finally the source terms have to be added. It is essential for the derivation of this result that, due to (6.23), no $O(\epsilon)$-terms occur in the argument of the determinant in (6.49). Thus the ghost term is independent of the form of the effective interaction term $\mathcal{L}_I$ as in the Faddeev–Popov formalism (see section 2.1). Because of the equivalence of all gauges [20, 23] the result (1.1) with (1.3) can be rewritten in any other gauge which can be derived within the Faddeev–Popov formalism.

The gauge theory given by (6.1) is spontaneously broken if the vacuum expectation value of the scalar fields (implied by the scalar self-interactions contained in V) is nonzero; this does not affect the above proof. Actually, this proof holds for both, SBGTs with a linearly realized scalar sector [3], and gauged nonlinear σ-models [2], because the latter ones can be obtained from the first ones by making a point transformation (as in (4.64)) in order to rewrite the scalar sector nonlinearly (this does not effect the Hamiltonion PI and yields only $\delta^4(0)$-terms in the Lagrangian PI (see sections 2.4, 2.7 and 4.3)) and then removing all Higgs contributions from the Lagrangian. Thus for an arbitrary effective gauge theory (without higher derivatives) the convenient Faddeev–Popov PI can be derived within the correct Hamiltonian PI formalism.

6.2 Effective Gauge Theories with Higher Derivatives

In this section I will generalize the HLE theorem to effective gauge theories with higher time derivatives by applying the result of section 5.2 that the equations of motion following from $\mathcal{L}_0$ in (6.1) can be applied in order to convert the effective interaction term $\mathcal{L}_I$ (by neglecting higher powers of ϵ) because the use of the EOM corresponds to a field transformation (5.28) (in this case φ may represent any field occurring in $\mathcal{L}$ (6.1)) which becomes a canonical transformation within the Ostrogradsky formalism and thus does not affect the Hamiltonian PI.

On the basis of this result, an arbitrary effective gauge theory can be reduced to one of the type considered in the previous section as follows: Due to the gauge invariance, derivatives of the fields occur in the effective interaction term only as covariant derivatives or through the field strength tensor. Using the identities (6.17), (6.18) and (6.19) (and the corresponding relations for $\bar{\psi}_a$ and $\varphi_a^\dagger$) one again rewrites all expressions in $\mathcal{L}_I$ such that the covariant time derivatives are applied to the fields before the covariant spatial derivatives. Then, higher time derivatives (and first time derivatives of A_0^a, ψ_a and $\bar{\psi}_a$) occur in $\mathcal{L}_I$ only through the expressions

$$D_0 F_{i0}^a, \qquad D_0 D_0 F_{ij}^a, \qquad D_0\psi_a, \qquad D_0\bar{\psi}_a, \qquad D_0 D_0\varphi_a, \qquad D_0 D_0 \varphi_a^\dagger \tag{6.52}$$

and even higher derivatives of these terms. After using (6.19) and (6.21) in order to rewrite $D_0 D_0 F_{ij}^a$ as

$$D_0 D_0 F_{ij}^a = D_j D_0 F_{i0}^a - D_i D_0 F_{j0}^a - 2g f_{abc} F_{i0}^b F_{j0}^c \tag{6.53}$$

one can convert all the terms (6.52) to terms without higher time derivatives (and without first time derivatives of A_0^a, ψ_a and $\bar{\psi}_a$) by using the EOM following from $\mathcal{L}_0$, viz.

$$D_0 F_{i0}^a \;=\; D_j F_{ij}^a - g\bar{\psi}_b \gamma_i t_a^{bc}\psi_c + ig\bar{t}_a^{bc}\left((D_i\varphi_b^\dagger)\varphi_c - \varphi_b^\dagger(D_i\varphi_c)\right), \tag{6.54}$$

$$D_0\psi_a = \gamma^0\left(\gamma_i D_i\psi_a - i\frac{\partial V}{\partial\bar{\psi}_a}\right), \tag{6.55}$$

$$D_0 D_0\varphi_a = D_i D_i\varphi_a - \frac{\partial V}{\partial\varphi_a^\dagger} \tag{6.56}$$

(and the corresponding equations for $\bar{\psi}_a$ and $\varphi_a^\dagger$). By repeated application of the EOM one can eliminate all higher time derivatives from $\mathcal{L}_I$. The fact that the EOM do not contain second time derivatives of A_0^a, ψ_a and $\bar{\psi}_a$ makes it possible to eliminate not only higher but also first time derivatives of these fields. The reduced first-order Lagrangian obtained by this procedure is gauge invariant, too, because the form of the EOM is invariant under gauge transformations and thus the use of the EOM does not affect the gauge freedom.

Now the HLE theorem for effective gauge theories with higher time derivatives can be proven as follows:

1. Given an arbitrary gauge invariant effective Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ (6.1), this can be reduced to an equivalent gauge invariant Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_{red}$ without higher time derivatives (and without first time derivatives of A_0^a, ψ_a and $\bar{\psi}_a$) by applying the EOM, i.e., actually by making field transformations such as (5.28). This does not affect the Hamiltonian PI (see chapter 5).

2. $\mathcal{L}_{red}$ can be quantized within the Hamiltonian PI formalism by applying the HLE theorem for first-order Lagrangians derived in section 6.1. This yields the Lagrangian PI
$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}\Phi \, \exp\left\{i\int d^4x \left[\mathcal{L}_{red} + \mathcal{L}_{g.f.} + \mathcal{L}_{ghost}\right]\right\} \tag{6.57}$$
in an arbitrary gauge.

3. Going reversely through the Faddeev–Popov procedure one can rewrite (6.57) (after introducing an infinite constant into the PI) as
$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}\Phi \, \exp\left\{i\int d^4x \, \mathcal{L}_{red}\right\}. \tag{6.58}$$

4. In the Lagrangian PI (6.58) the field transformations (5.28) applied in step 1 are done inversely in order to reconstruct the primordial effective Lagrangian[3]. This yields
$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}\Phi \, \exp\left\{i\int d^4x \, \mathcal{L}\right\}. \tag{6.59}$$
The Jacobian determinant implied by change of the functional integration measure corresponding to these transformations only yields extra $\delta^4(0)$-terms (see [28] and section 5.2) which are neglected here.

---

[3] Note that the use of the transformations (5.28) in (6.57) would result in an application of the EOM following from $\mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{L}_{g.f.} + \mathcal{L}_{ghost}$ (and not from $\mathcal{L}_0$ alone) which would not yield the desired result.

5. Applying the Faddeev–Popov formalism[4] to (6.59) and adding the source terms one finally finds (1.1) with (1.3) in an arbitrary gauge.

This completes the proof of the HLE theorem for effective gauge theories.

---

[4] In distiction from naive Lagrangian PI quantization, (6.59) is not taken as an ansatz here but it has been derived from the correct Hamiltonian PI.

Chapter 7

Summary

In this thesis I have proven the Hamilton–Lagrange equivalence theorem (Matthews's theorem) for effective Lagrangians with arbitrary interactions of the physically most important types of particles, namely scalars, fermions, massless and massive and vector bosons. This theorem states that the convenient Lagrangian path integral can be derived from the correct (but more involved) Hamiltonian path intergral. This means that the Feynman rules, which are the basis for calculations of S-Matrix elements and cross sections, can directly be obtained from the Lagrangian in the usual way.

In particular, this theorem is valid for all types of gauge theories with arbitrary (but gauge invariant) interaction terms, namely for gauge theories without spontaneous symmetry breaking, for spontaneously broken gauge theories with a nonlinearly realized scalar sector (gauged nonlinear σ-models, chiral Lagrangians) and for sponteneously broken gauge theories with a linearly realized scalar sector (Higgs models). This means that an arbitrary gauge theory can be quantized within the (Lagrangian) Faddeev–Popov formalism.

I have paid specific attention to the investigation of effective Lagrangians with massive vector fields (both with and without a spontaneously broken gauge symmetry). Each spontaneously broken gauge theory can be related to its unitary gauge by applying a Stueckelberg transformation (after making a point transformation that delinearizes the scalar sector in the case of a Higgs model); the U-gauge Lagrangian is obtained by simply removing all unphysical scalar fields from the gauge invariant Lagrangian. On the other hand, by using the Stueckelberg formalism one can rewrite an arbitrary gauge noninvariant Lagrangian as a (nonlinearly realized) spontaneously broken gauge theory and extend it, by introducing (a) physical Higgs boson(s), to a (linearly realized) Higgs model. I have reformulated the Stuekkelberg formalism within the Hamiltonian formalism, thereby establishing the equivalence of Lagrangians which are related to each other by a Stueckelberg transformation.

The Hamilton–Lagrange equivalence theorem even applies to effective Lagrangians with higher derivatives of the fields. Each effective higher-order Lagrangian can be reduced to a first-order one by applying the equations of motion to the effective interaction term in order to remove all higher time derivatives. This use of the equations of motion is correct because it can be realized by making field transformations that involve derivatives of the fields. I have shown that Lagrangians which are related to each other by local field transformations are physically equivalent (at the classical and at the quantum level) even if these transformations depend on derivatives, because they become canonical transformations within the Hamiltonian treatment of higher-order Lagrangians (Ostrogradsky formalism). Thus, an effective higher-order Lagrangian can formally be treated in the same way as a first-order one; all unphysical effects, which normally occur when dealing with higher-order Lagrangians, are absent because an effective Lagrangian is assumed to parametrize the low-energy effects of well-behaved "new physics".

Many of the above statements are obvious within the naive Lagrangian path integral formalism. However, one has to apply the more elaborate Hamiltonian procedure of this thesis to derive them correctly. Indeed, the results obtained in this thesis justify the straightforward treatment of effective Lagrangians in the phenomenological literature.

Acknowledgements

I thank Prof. Dr. Dieter Schildknecht for giving me the opportunity to do this work, for arising my interest in the Stueckelberg formalism, for his tolerance of letting me develop own ideas and concepts aside from his original intentions and for interesting discussions. I am very grateful to Prof. Dr. Reinhart Kögerler for his encouragement and advice, for many important, illuminating and stimulating discussions and for very good collaboration. I enjoyed useful discussions with Dr. Mikhail Bilenky and with Dr. Jan Sładkowski.

Bibliography

[1] K. Gaemers and G. Gounaris, Z. Phys. **C1**, 259 (1979);
K. Hagiwara, R. D. Peccei, D. Zeppenfeld and K. Hisaka, Nucl. Phys. **B282**, 253 (1987);
M. Kuroda, J. Maalampi, K. H. Schwarzer and D. Schildknecht, Nucl. Phys. **B284**, 271 (1987);
D. Zeppenfeld and S. Willenbrock, Phys. Rev. **D37**, 1775 (1988);
G. Gounaris, J. L. Kneur, J. Layssac, G. Moultaka, F. M. Renard and D. Schildknecht, in e^+e^- *Collisions at 500 GeV, The Physics Potential*, ed. P. W. Zerwas, DESY Report DESY 92-123 (1992), p. 735;
G. Gounaris, J. Layssac, G. Moultaka, and F. M. Renard, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A8**, 3285 (1993);
M. Bilenky, J. L. Kneur, F. M. Renard and D. Schildknecht, Nucl. Phys. **B409**, 22 (1993)

[2] T. Appelquist and C. Bernard, Phys. Rev. **D22**, 200 (1980);
A. C. Longhitano, Nucl. Phys. **B188**, 118 (1981);
A. Dobado, D. Espriu and M. J. Herrero, Phys. Lett. **B225**, 405 (1991);
B. Holdom, Phys. Lett. **B258**, 156 (1991);
A. Falk, M. Luke and E. Simmons, Nucl. Phys. **B365**, 523 (1991);
D. Espriu and M. J. Herrero, Nucl. Phys. **B373**, 117 (1991);
T. Appelquist and G.-H. Wu, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 3235 (1993);
M. J. Herrero and E. R. Morales, Madrid Preprint FTUAM 93/24 (1993), hep-ph/9308276

[3] C. N. Leung, S. T. Love and S. Rao, Z. Phys. **C31**, 433 (1986);
W. Buchmüller and D. Wyler, Nucl. Phys. **B268**, 621 (1986);
A. de Rújula, M. B. Gavela, P. Hernández and E. Massó, Nucl. Phys. **B384**, 3 (1992);
K. Hagiwara, S. Ishihara, R. Szalapski and D. Zeppenfeld, Phys. Lett. **B283**, 353 (1992);
G. J. Gounaris and F. M. Renard, Z. Phys. **C59**, 133 (1993);
C. Grosse-Knetter and D. Schildknecht, Phys. Lett. **B302**, 309 (1993);
P. Hernández and F. J. Vegas, Phys. Lett. **B307**, 116 (1993);
K. Hagiwara, S. Ishihara, R. Szalapski and D. Zeppenfeld, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 2182 (1993);
C. Grosse-Knetter, I. Kuss and D. Schildknecht, Z. Phys. **C60**, 375 (1993)

[4] C. N. Leung, S. T. Love and S. Rao, ref. [3];
W. Buchmüller and D. Wyler, ref. [3];
E. H. Simmons, Phys. Lett. **B226**, 132 (1989); Phys. Lett. **B246**, 471 (1990);
H. Dreiner, A. Duff and D. Zeppenfeld, Phys. Lett. **B282**, 441 (1992)

[5] P. T. Matthews, Phys. Rev. **76**, 684 (1949)

[6] R. P. Feynman, Rev. Mod. Phys. **20**, 367 (1948);
R. P. Feynman and A. R. Hibbs, *Quantum Mechanics and Path Integrals*, McGraw-Hill (1965)

[7] L. D. Faddeev and V. N. Popov, Phys. Lett. **B25**, 29 (1967)

[8] T.-P. Cheng and L.-F. Li, *Gauge theory of elementary particle physics*, Oxford University Press (1984);
L. H. Ryder, *Quantum Field Theory*, Cambridge University Press (1985);
D. Bailin and A. Love, *Introduction to Gauge Field Theory*, Hilger (1986);
S. Pokorsky, *Gauge Field Theories*, Cambridge University Press (1987);
P. H. Frampton, *Gauge Field Theories*, Addison-Wesley (1987);
P. Ramond, *Field Theory: A Modern Primer*, Addison-Wesley (1989)

[9] L. D. Faddeev, Teor. Mat. Fiz. **1**, 3 (1969) [Transl.: Theor. Math. Phys. **1**, 1 (1970)]

[10] C. Bernard and A. Duncan, Phys. Rev. **D11**, 848 (1975)

[11] P. Senjanovic, Ann. Phys. **100**, 227 (1976)

[12] A. Hanson, T. Regge and C. Teitelboim, *Constrained Hamiltonian Systems*, Accad. Naz. dei Lincei (1976);
K. Sundermeyer, *Constrained Dynamics*, Springer (1982);
J. Govaerts, *Hamiltonian Quantization and Constrained Dynamics*, Leuven University Press (1991);
M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, *Quantization of Gauge Systems*, Princeton University Press (1992)

[13] D. M. Gitman and I. V. Tyutin, *Quantization of Fields with Constraints*, Springer (1990)

[14] P. A. M. Dirac, Can. J. Math. **2**, 129 (1950); *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics*, Belfar (1964)

[15] A. Dresse, J. M. L. Fisch, P. Gregoire and M. Henneaux, Nucl. Phys. **B354**, 191 (1991);
G. V. Grigorian, R. P. Grigorian and I. V. Tuytin, Nucl. Phys. **B379**, 304 (1992);
F. De Jonghe, Phys. Lett. **B316**, 503 (1993)

[16] E. S. Fradkin and G. A. Vilkovisky, Phys. Lett. **B55**, 224 (1975);
I. A. Batalin and G. A. Vilkovisky, Phys. Lett. **B69**, 309 (1977);

E. S. Fradkin and T. E. Fradkina, Phys. Lett. **B72**, 343 (1978);
M. Henneaux, Phys. Rep. **126**, 1 (1985)

[17] I. A. Batalin and G. A. Vilkovisky, Phys. Lett. **B102**, 27, (1981); Phys. Rev. **D28**, 2567 (1983); Nucl. Phys. **B234**, 106 (1984); J. Math. Phys. **26**, 172 (1985)

[18] E. C. G. Stueckelberg, Helv. Phys. Acta **11**, 299 (1938)

[19] T. Kunimasa and T. Goto, Prog. Theor. Phys. **37**, 452 (1967)

[20] B. W. Lee and J. Zinn-Justin, Phys. Rev. **D5**, 3121, 3137, 3155 (1972), **D7**, 1049 (1973)

[21] J. M. Cornwall, D. N. Levin and G. Tiktopoulos, Phys. Rev. **D10**, 1145 (1974)

[22] M. Chanowitz, M. Golden and H. Georgi, Phys. Rev. **D36**, 1490 (1987);
C. P. Burgess and D. London, McGill Preprint McGill-92/04 (1992), hep-ph/9203215; Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 3428 (1992)

[23] E. S. Abers and B. W. Lee, Phys. Rep. **9**, 1 (1973)

[24] T. Appelquist and C. Bernard, ref. [2];
A. C. Longhitano, ref. [2];
C. N. Leung, S. T. Love and S. Rao, ref. [3];
B. Grinstein and M. B. Wise, ref. [3];
E. H. Simmons, ref. [4];
G. J. Gounaris and F. M. Renard, ref. [3];
K. Hagiwara, S. Ishihara, R. Szalapski and D. Zeppenfeld, ref. [3]

[25] M. V. Ostrogradsky, Mem. Acad. St. Petersbourg **6**, 385 (1850)

[26] A. Pais and G. Uhlenbeck, Phys. Rev. **79**, 145 (1950);
C. Bernard and A. Duncan, ref. [10];
S. W. Hawking, in *Quantum Field Theory and Quantum Statistics*, ed.: I. A. Batalin, C. J. Isham and C. A. Vilkovisky, Hilger (1987), p. 129;
D. A. Eliezer and R. P. Woodard, Nucl. Phys. **B325**, 389 (1989);
J. Z. Simon, Phys. Rev. **D41**, 3720 (1990)

[27] D. Barua and S. N. Gupta, Phys. Rev. **D16**, 413 (1977);
G. Schäfer, Phys. Lett. **A100**, 128 (1984);
T. Damour and G. Schäfer, J. Math. Phys. **32**, 127 (1991);
H. Georgi, Nucl. Phys. **B361**, 339 (1991);
H. Leutwyler, Bern Preprint BUTP-91/26 (1991)

[28] H. D. Politzer, Nucl. Phys. **B172**, 349 (1980);
C. Arzt, Michigan Preprint UM-TH-92-28 (1992), hep-ph/9304230

[29] G. Leibbrandt, Rev. Mod. Phys. **47**, 849 (1975)

[30] K. Fujikawa, B. W. Lee and A. I. Sanda, Phys. Rev. **D6**, 2923 (1972)

[31] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **D7**, 2887 (1973)

[32] T. D. Lee and C. N. Yang, Phys. Rev. **128**, 885 (1962)

[33] A. Salam and J. Strathdee, Phys. Rev. **D2**, 2869 (1970)

[34] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **D7**, 1068 (1973)

[35] T. Appelquist and H. Quinn, Phys. Lett. **B39**, 229 (1972)

[36] S. D. Joglekar, Ann. Phys. **83**, 427 (1974)

[37] R. Jackiw and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **D5**, 2396 (1972);
I. Bars and M. Yoshimura, Phys. Rev. **D6**, 374 (1972)

[38] T. Sonoda and S. Y. Tsai, Prog. Theor. Phys. **71**, 878 (1984)

[39] R. Delburgo, S. Twisk and G. Thompson, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A3**, 435 (1988)

[40] W. A. Bardeen and K. Shizuya, Phys. Rev. **D18**, 1969 (1978)

[41] T. Appelquist and C. Bernard, ref. [2];
A. C. Longhitano, ref. [2]

[42] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **19**, 1264 (1967);
A. Salam, in *Elementary Particle Theory: Relativistic Groups and Analyticty (Nobel Symposiun No. 8)*, ed. N. Svartholm, Almquist and Wiksells (1968), p. 367

[43] C. Grosse-Knetter and R. Kögerler, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 2865 (1993)

[44] P. W. Higgs, Phys. Rev. **145**, 1156 (1966);
T. W. B. Kibble, Phys. Rev. **155**, 1554 (1967)

[45] J. M. Cornwall, D. N. Levin and G. Tiktopoulos, Phys. Rev. Lett. **30**, 1268 (1973);
C. H. Llewellyn Smith, Phys. Lett. **B46**, 233 (1973)

[46] K. Shizuya, Nucl. Phys. **B121**, 125 (1977)

[47] A. Burnel, Phys. Rev. **D33**, 2985 (1986)

[48] J. Alfaro and P. H. Damgaard, Ann. Phys. **202**, 398 (1990)

[49] A. de Rújula, M. B. Gavela, P. Hernández and E. Massó, ref. [3]

[50] K. Hagiwara, S. Ishihara, R. Szalapski and D. Zeppenfeld, ref. [3];
P. Hernández and F. J. Vegas, ref. [3]

[51] G. J. Gounaris and F. M. Renard, ref. [3]

[52] H. Goldstein, *Classical Mechanics*, Addison-Wesley, second edition (1980);
L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifschitz, *Lehrbuch der theoretischen Physik, Band I: Mechanik*, Akademie-Verlag (1976);
F. Kuypers, *Klassische Mechanik*, VCH, second edition (1989)

[53] S. Kaptanoğlu, Phys. Lett. **B98**, 77 (1981);
P. Ditsas, Ann. Phys. **167**, 36 (1986)

[54] D. M. Gitman, I. V. Tuytin and Y. S. Prager, Sov. Phys. Journ. **26**, 760 (1983)

[55] C. P. Burgess and D. London, McGill Preprint McGill-92/05 (1992), hep-ph/9203216; Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 3428 (1992)

[56] G. Moultaka, Montpellier Preprint PM/93-20 (1993), hep-ph/9310282

[57] C. Grosse-Knetter, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 2854 (1993)

[58] S. Coleman, Lectures given at the the 1973 International Summer School of Physics “Ettore Majorana”, Harvard report (unpublished), p. 42

[59] N. K. Pak and R. Percacci, J. Math. Phys. **30**, 2951 (1989)

[60] P. Mitra and R. Rajaraman, Ann. Phys. **203**, 157 (1990);
K. Harada and H. Mukaida, Z. Phys. **C48**, 151 (1990);
R. Anishetty and A. S. Vytheeswaran, Madras Preprint imsc-92/10 (1992)

[61] L. D. Faddeev and S. L. Shatashvili, Phys. Lett. **B167**, 225 (1986)

[62] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **27**, 1688 (1971)

[63] H. O. Girotti and H. J. Rothe, Nuov. Cim. **75A**, 62 (1983)

[64] J. Barcelos-Neto and C. P. Natividade, Z. Phys. **C51**, 313 (1991)

[65] C. Grosse-Knetter, Bielefeld Preprint BI-TP 93/29 (1993), hep-ph/9306310

[66] T. Kimura, Lett. Nuov. Cim. **5**, 81 (1972);
V. Tapai, Nuov. Cim. **90B**, 15 (1985);
Y. Saito, R. Sugano, T. Ohta and T. Kimura, J. Math. Phys. **30**, 1122 (1989);
V. V. Nestorenko, J. Phys. **A22**, 1673 (1989)

[67] J. M. Pons, Lett. Math. Phys. **17**, 181 (1989)

[68] J. S. R. Chisholm, Nucl. Phys. **26**, 469 (1961);
S. Kamefuchi, L. O’Raifeartaigh and A. Salam, Nucl. Phys. **28**, 529 (1961)

[69] W. Buchmüller and D. Wyler, ref. [3]

[70] C. Grosse-Knetter, I. Kuss and D. Schildknecht, ref. [3]

[71] C. Grosse-Knetter, Bielefeld Preprint BI-TP 93/40 (1993), hep-ph/9308201, to be published in Phys. Rev. **D**

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9311259v1

This figure "fig1-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9311259v1